THIS BOOK IS A PART OF

THE GEORGE H. VON TUNGELN
MEMORIAL LIBRARY

ESTABLISHED BY
HIS WIDOW AND MAJOR STUDENTS

PRESENTED TO
THE DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS
AND SOCIOLOGY

1 9 4 4

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

TWENTY-FOUR VIEWS OF MARRIAGE

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK · BOSTON · CHICAGO · DALLAS
ATLANTA · SAN FRANCISCO

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED
LONDON · BOMBAY · CALCUTTA
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
OF CANADA, LIMITED
TORONTO

TWENTY-FOUR VIEWS OF MARRIAGE

From the Presbyterian General Assembly's Commission on Marriage, Divorce and Remarriage

Edited by

CLARENCE A. SPAULDING

Withdrawn
IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
of Science and Technology
Library

NEW YORK
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
1930

Copyright, 1930,
By THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.

All rights reserved—no part of this book may be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher.

Set up and printed. Published November, 1930.

SET UP BY BROWN BROTHERS LINOTYPERS
PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY THE FERRIS PRINTING COMPANY

92t

DEDICATED

TO

THE CHRISTIAN HOME

Marriage is an institution ordained of God for the honor and happiness of mankind, in which one man and one woman enter into a bodily and spiritual union, pledging each to the other mutual love, honor, fidelity, forbearance and comradeship, such as should assure an unbroken continuance of their wedlock so long as both shall live.

This institution finds its primary justification in the establishment and maintenance of the Christian home in which children shall be born and nurtured in the Christian faith.

On the side of civil government, the Church recognizes marriage as a legal contract involving the moral obligations of Christian citizenship.

846456

"WHITHER THOU GOEST, I WILL GO; AND WHERE THOU LODGEST, I WILL LODGE; WHERE THOU DIEST, WILL I DIE; THY PEOPLE SHALL BE MY PEOPLE, AND THY GOD MY GOD."

The Book of Ruth.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U. S. A. ON THE STUDY OF MARRIAGE, DIVORCE AND REMARRIAGE.

Ministers:

Ralph Marshall Davis, D.D., Chairman
Clarence A. Spaulding, D.D.
Howard A. Johnston, D.D.
J. W. Claudy, D.D.
Ralph C. McAfee
Kenneth D. Miller

Ruling Elders:

E. D. Roberts
Frederick P. Vose
Dr. John C. Acheson
Judge Edward J. Fox
W. J. Kyle

PREFACE

WHAT is it that makes marriage and the institution of the home more of a problem today than in past generations? What is wrong with marriage that was not always wrong? Who has tampered with the ancient and well-bound Pandora's Box and loosed all the queries and questions that once never saw the light?

Are marriages any less happy today than in ages gone by? Or did our parents simply have a greater capacity to endure? Will we find upon looking at the problem from every angle that a modern novelist was right when he said, "It takes a lot of religion to marry, raise children, and bring up grandchildren"?

Are there changing fashions in morals as well as in clothes? Is relativity a principle as applicable in the realm of morals as in the physical world? Is there "a moral equivalent to adultery"? Are there "tyrannies of disposition" and "mordant hostilities" of nature that can be classed in the same category as loose sexual conduct?

A survey of the investigations conducted by both the Federal Council and the Episcopal Church reveals the fact that there is no great problem of divorce when both parties are practicing an active religious life. The problem increases when one of the parties is only a nominal Christian. It becomes more serious and critical when neither party makes a religious profession. The conclusion of such a survey can only be that there are two fundamental views of marriage; Christian and Pagan.

It is not the purpose of this volume to add to the vast

amount of literature already written about marriage, divorce, or the general problem of sex. Rather it is an effort to present within the span of one volume, outstanding chapters from already recognized and established books and magazine articles, so that the reader can have the whole problem of human relations presented to him from the angle not only of the conservative, but also of the liberal, and even radical.

The Commission of the Presbyterian Church have no fear of presenting in such a volume ideas and points of view to which they, themselves, cannot subscribe. They believe they represent ideas that are honestly but erroneously held, and that when placed side by side with the idealism, as well as practicality of Jesus, the truth will justify and vindicate itself.

Unquestionably there is abroad in this present generation a Psychology of Impermanence with reference to marriage. It has been created as a result of negative and destructive critical writings. The great need of the day is the recreation of a Psychology of Permanence and facing fairly and without flinching, not only the difficulties but the blessings of married life.

In presenting this volume to the public, the Commission desires to express its deep appreciation and thanks, not only to the authors themselves, but to the publishers, for their glad and enthusiastic coöperation.

It desires to thank particularly Dr. G. V. Hamilton of Santa Barbara, of the Rockefeller Research in Studies of Marriage, and Mr. Paul Popenoe, the Executive Secretary of the Human Betterment Foundation, and the Institute of Family Relations in Los Angeles, for their invaluable suggestions as to the material that should be included in this volume.

CLARENCE A. SPAULDING.

Santa Barbara,
July 27, 1930.

INTRODUCTION

BERTRAND RUSSELL in accepting the invitation of the Editor to contribute to this Symposium said, "I am highly honored by the suggestion . . . and am very much interested that the Presbyterian Church should be undertaking such a work as you describe. . . . I feel inclined to offer my sincerest respects on this account."

In a similar vein the then Moderator of the Presbyterian Church, Dr. Cleland Boyd McAfee, informed the Commission at its first meeting in Chicago in December, 1929, "that wherever he went, he found no work of the Church being watched with greater interest or arousing such enthusiastic anticipation as the work which the Commission was created to undertake." [1]

What the Church Faces

There is a unanimous agreement both inside and outside of the Church on one point. Christianity has failed to repro-

[1] Action of General Assembly, 1929:

"Whereas the Presbytery of Dubuque requests the General Assembly to study and give to the whole church a clear deliverance on divorce and remarriage; and

"Whereas, it seems that this subject of divorce and remarriage cannot be adequately studied nor pronounced upon without a careful study of the larger subject of marriage itself; and

"Whereas, the study of marriage in our present social status is deserving of profound consideration,

"Therefore, the Committee on Bills and Overtures respectfully recommends that the Moderator appoint a Commission of not less than eleven members, six of whom shall be ministers and five elders to make an exhaustive study of the subject of marriage, divorce, and subsequent remarriage, making use of the studies available and analyses of the statutes of the several states on the subject and the efforts of the Protestant churches and social service agencies to deal with it, and report its conclusions and recommendations to the General Assembly of 1930."

duce in the present generation the Christian marriage ideal. We know what happens to a race that biologically fails to reproduce itself; it becomes extinct. We realize what results when a nation fails to reproduce its political and social ideals; there is revolution, overthrow of government; anarchy and bolshevism flourish like the proverbial bay tree. The result of this neglect on the part of the Church to inculcate in the present generation the divine principles that sanctify marriage and educate it in regard to the spiritual qualities necessary for a successful Christian home is obvious. It has culminated in a sex stampede and a practical acceptance of a pagan standard of life and living on a hitherto unprecedented scale.

What is needed under the circumstances, as one of our wise moral leaders has reminded us: [2]

> is not more marriage laws upon our statute books or more binding words in the marriage ritual. We need a nobler concept of the marriage relationship in the minds of men and women. Before the altar is reached and the words are spoken, we need to have planted in the lives of lovers an intelligent and reverent understanding of the serious responsibilities of married life.

Much of the confusion in the discussion of marriage has arisen not only from failure of those who think of it as a relationship between two individuals, to recognize the concern of society, and conversely the failure of those who think of marriage as the concern of society, to recognize the rights of the individual, but the confusion arises also from perverted theories of marriage and pagan views of sex with

[2] Wm. Chalmers Covert, D.D., in an address "Christian Education and Modern Life Problems," before 142nd Annual General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. at Cincinnati, Ohio, June 2, 1930.

numerous self-appointed moralists saying, "This is the way, walk ye therein."

The time has come for the Church to become vocal on the subject of marriage. In his report to the General Assembly, Dr. Ralph Marshall Davis, D.D., Chairman of the Commission, said: [8]

> We clergymen are justly criticized that we have spent much of our time in other than the sane, helpful and scientific teaching of our young people on this subject. We have not been either willing or skilled in the treatment of poorly adjusted lives. We have all been guilty of permitting false ideals to be presented in our communities and have let them go unrebuked. Too many of us have performed marriages in the name of Christ without properly looking into the moral fitness of the candidates. It is possible for the pastor first to furnish himself and then to form classes in which he may give young people of proper age the ideals and facts of marriage, talks on personal purity and sex life and present the Christian morality at every step as it may appear in the discussion. The silence of the clergy on these important themes is one of the ominous signs in all this horrible catastrophe which has overtaken us.
>
> If it should become generally known that the ministry is really competent to deal with these life situations, it will make unnecessary this crop of social advisers who are trying vainly to deal with this welter without the help of the motives which personal religion supplies. We shall regain not only the respect of the community but also our authority when we are found capable of dealing with all those values that make for nobility in

[8] See Chapter IX, "Romance and Religion" of this volume for complete report.

> living. We shall be assisting men where they are most helpless in dealing with the situation themselves: namely, in their love-life, and we shall be able, in case after case, to show that marriage involves love, suffering, sacrifice and may lead to those great tragic moods of the spirit which, while they shake the soul, make it.
>
> Youth should be told that marriage is not specifically for the specific ends of desire. It is not the legalized arena where lust may play its bestial rôle. It is the serious entering into that redemptive sharing of life which involves the shedding of blood. Their minds should be disabused of the cheap theory that the basis of marriage is happiness. While marriage has a stake in physical happiness, it normally looks forward to the procreation of offspring and their training. This means responsibility of such high quality that only the hardy will hazard it.

Believing, therefore, that a primary necessity among Christian leaders is a more intelligent understanding of the current mind both of the popular masses and of special sociological students on what really constitutes marriage and the proper conditions and limitation that should be imposed on the privilege of divorce, the Commission of the Presbyterian Church has sought to meet that need by making available the best pronouncements on this subject by leading religious, moral, social, psychological, biological, and judicial students, who while revealing divergent opinions on details might help establish a consensus of virile opinion on the permanence and sacredness of the marriage tie, the domestic and social obligations of those who enter into married relations, and the need of perpetuating the integrity of family life in the face of disintegrating social influences and personal delinquencies.

This volume in no sense claims to be a logical or complete critical treatise of the marriage problem. It is a symposium. The chapters, however, have, we believe, certain coherence and fit into each other like a mosaic. Popular in character though the work will be, running through the book is a strongly scientific note. Believing in a scientific age that the marriage of the future must be on a scientific, as well as spiritual basis, provision has been made in the following pages for the expression of this phase of the marriage problem. Outstanding scientists, physicians, psychiatrists, philosophers, have been asked to make their contributions on the subjects of monogamy, sex, promiscuity, etc. Surely these men cannot be accused of a moralist's bias!

When once this present generation discovers that the Christian marriage ideal is based upon demonstrable scientific data and not upon the misanthropy of St. Paul or the monasticism of Catholicism as some of the critics of marriage would have us believe, much of the criticism now disturbing the institution of marriage will die of its own volition.

CLARENCE A. SPAULDING.

Santa Barbara,
July 17, 1930.

CONTENTS

PAGE

Preface ix

Introduction by the Editor xi

CHAPTER

I. A Summary of Facts 1
G. V. Hamilton

II. Broken Homes 9
Paul Popenoe

III. The Will to Love 23
Elizabeth C. Adams

IV. The Evolution of Love 28
Toyohiko Kagawa

V. Christian Ethics 54
Bertrand Russell

VI. What God Hath Not Joined 68
Joseph Fort Newton

VII. What Is Marriage? 81
Maude Royden

VIII. The Crisis in Morals 103
Gilbert Murray

IX. Romance and Religion 118
Ralph Marshall Davis

X. The Proper Choice of Partners 134
Count Hermann Keyserling

CHAPTER PAGE

XI. The Problems of Marriage 147
George Sherwood Eddy

XII. The Permanent Elements of Family Life . 166
Henry Frederick Cope

XIII. The Function of the Family 173
Robert C. and Frances Williams Binkley

XIV. Companionate Marriage 193
Benjamin B. Lindsey

XV. The Doctor Looks at Companionate Marriage 205
Joseph Collins

XVI. Monogamic Marriage as a Solution of Human Mating 218
Thomas Walton Galloway

XVII. The Biological Basis of Family Life . . . 239
Herbert Spencer Jennings

XVIII. Love in the Great Society 259
Walter Lippmann

XIX. The Husband 286
E. R. Groves and W. F. Ogburn

XX. The New Marriage 306
Wilfred Lay

XXI. Free Divorce 324
Ellen Key

XXII. The Discipline of Sex 343
Edward Sapir

XXIII. Promiscuity and the Social Order . . . 361
Sir Arthur Newsholme

CHAPTER PAGE
XXIV. Sex and the Physician 376
A. A. Brill

Appendix:

Statement of the British Social Hygiene Council on Continence 395

Report of the Federal Council's Commission on Marriage and Home 405
Extracts from

Report of the Episcopal Commission on Divorce, Its Conditions and Causes 420
Extracts from

Sterilization for Human Betterment, Introduction 439
E. S. Gosney

Classified Bibliography 446

TWENTY-FOUR VIEWS OF MARRIAGE

A SUMMARY OF FACTS *

The Most Important and Significant Points Developed by the Research. A Bird's-eye View of Two Hundred Marriages.

G. V. HAMILTON

Dr. Hamilton was born in Frazeysburg, Ohio, on January 15, 1877, where he spent his early youth. In 1898 he graduated from the Ohio Wesleyan University with the degree of B.A. He continued his studies at the Jefferson Medical College, receiving his M.D. in 1901. He served his Interneship at the Jewish Hospital of Philadelphia and from 1902-05 was the Assistant Superintendent of the State Hospital for the Insane, Warren, Pennsylvania. During the years 1905-07 he was a graduate student at Harvard University and during a considerable part of his professional life he has majored in Comparative Psychology and in Psychiatry, being the Director of Research in the Division of Psychobiological Research of The Bureau of Social Hygiene, New York. In recent years he conducted the research in Marriage under the direction of the Rockefeller Foundation.

He is author of the following books: *Objective Psychopathology; A Research in Marriage; What Is Wrong with Marriage* (with Kenneth Macgowan); *The Adversary in Tomika* (a novel now in press in New York).

Dr. Hamilton resides in Santa Barbara and is studying therapeutic method in conjunction with clinical work.

The following chapter is taken from his very valuable work, *What Is Wrong with Marriage,* being the summary of his findings in that important research.

THE following summary states as briefly as possible the most significant and interesting points developed in the research. It supplies, in a sense, a bird's-eye view of the marriages of two hundred men and women.

The men were more happily married than the women. Fifty-one men had achieved happy marriages, against forty-

* From *What Is Wrong with Marriage,* by Hamilton and Macgowan, published by Albert and Charles Boni, New York, 1929, and reprinted with their kind permission and that of the authors.

five women. The fifty-five married couples showed about the same ratio. The age of the people and the age of the marriages made little difference except in the case of the very youngest men and women or the very youngest marriages. Sixty-one per cent of the men who had been married less than four years were happy. The women were still happier —sixty-four per cent: they had not yet been disillusioned.

Marriages late in life proved notably happier than early marriages. Out of the men married between thirty and thirty-four, sixty-six per cent were happy, against sixty-three per cent of the women. Only thirty-two per cent of the men who had married before twenty-four were happy, and only twenty-eight per cent of the women. More women married between twenty and twenty-four than in any other five-year period.

Men married to women who were one to three years older proved the happiest. Women married to husbands of equal age showed twice as large a proportion of happy marriages as those married to men one to five years older. Women married to much older men were happier than the average. Here we found the reëstablishment of the son-mother and daughter-father relationship making for matrimonial comfort.

The men and women who had never attended college were more happily married than the college graduates. Where the husband and wife had an equal amount of formal education, the couples were above the average of happiness. Superior education made those men and women unhappy whose mates did not have it, and made the under-educated mates more than usually content.

The women grew dissatisfied with their marriages earlier than the men. When asked if they would end their marriages if they could press a button and find that they had never been married, more women than men—thirty-six to thirty-four—said they would do so. More women than men

—twenty-six to twenty-three—said they would not wish to marry, knowing what they now know. More women than men—twenty-five to twenty-two—said they would prefer not to go on living with their mates because they no longer loved them. Many more women than men—fifty-three to thirty-seven—voted their marriages failures.

The women found more causes of dissatisfaction in their marriages than did the men. From three-fifths to two-thirds lodged complaints. The primary and strongest complaint of the women was over the sexual; in the main they found their husbands too amorous. The men complained first of all of temperamental difficulties and put the sexual second; on sex, they complained that their wives were not amorous enough. In total number of complaints—allowing each man or woman to mention as many as he pleased—temperamental troubles exceeded sexual troubles, and the sense of domestic slavery or lack of personal freedom came third. The women were more inclined than the men to believe themselves socially ill-mated. They were also more inclined to believe themselvs intellectually ill-mated; but the difference was not so sharp.

Economic friction played a smaller part in the unhappiness of these men and women than psychiatrists commonly suppose. The women were so overwhelmingly more sensitive to economic friction. They complained more of bad treatment, and they believed their husbands thought them extravagant or unfair when few husbands actually did think so.

The size of the income made less difference to the married happiness of the men than to that of the women. Between the old-fashioned system of no allowances for the wives, allowances or budgets, and joint bank accounts, the old-fashioned arrangement showed the most happiness for both men and women, and the partnership basis showed the least. Wage earning wives were less happy than the average, and

so were their husbands. By and large, economic troubles seemed merely a handy peg on which to hang deeper complaints.

The women were more intent on material troubles than the men, but were more sensitive all along the line. They were readier to see everything wrong. They catalogued more dissatisfactions. They particularized far more. They saw three times as many good traits and bad traits in their husbands' dispositions as the men did in their wives'.

The women of this research, like all female primates, were sexually responsive and sexually provocative at all times, and not, like the lower order of mammals, only when physiologically ready to conceive. On the other hand, they reported that they felt maximum desire, in the main, just after their monthly period.

Only four women said they did not wish to have children, yet not one man or woman had refrained from using contraceptives at some time or other, except those who were sterile. Only half of them felt that the contraceptives they used were safe. Less than a third of the women and less than a quarter of the men had found satisfactory contraceptives.

While many of the people reported that physical intercourse was a matter of mutual desire, more women than men reported that for them it was often or usually case of submission to the mate's desire. The submissive men were all over thirty-seven. More than a third of the men reported some inability to have physical intercourse as often as their mates desired it. Eighty-five per cent of the men still found their mates sexually attractive; only sixty-six per cent of the women said the same. Over-sexed mates produced less than the average proportion of happy marriages; the wives of under-sexed husbands showed only eighteen per cent of happy marriages.

In proposing alterations in their mates, the men and women put the greatest emphasis on changing mental and

temperamental qualities. The men put physical changes next and changes in habits last. The women put habits above physique.

The women were more concerned with the conversational qualities of their husbands than with any other changes, and they wanted to increase the men's talkativeness, while the men wanted to make their wives less talkative. Next, the women wanted to make their husbands less selfish, less bad tempered, and more affectionate. The men wanted better tempers in their wives, better intelligence, and more passionate natures.

The men were much more concerned than the women about improving the physical appearance of their mates. Almost half the men wanted to improve their wives' figures and almost a quarter wanted to improve the skin—both physical features that deteriorate with age. The women paid no attention to withering charms—except loss of hair. They voted in the main to change unchangeable features—particularly the height—in order to bring their mates nearer the appearance of their fathers.

The research supplied much corroboration of the importance of the Œdipus complex as affecting a man's relations to his wife. Those men who had been on reasonably affectionate terms with their mothers were most happily married. Those who had been unhappy with their mothers and those who had been extravagantly attached to them were below the average of married happiness. The men who had married women who resembled the men's mothers either physically or temperamentally were notably happier in their marriages.

These same things held true for the women, with modifications due to the fear of incest. The intimate relation of both boy and girl to the mother, and the greater distance between both children and the father appeared to make the women fear incest more and the men homosexuality.

Greater happiness may result from following the pattern

of the Œdipus complex, but much the larger proportion of the men and women ran counter to it. They appeared to invite unhappiness in an attempt to escape inbreeding. The women—more disturbed by fear of incest—were even less ready than men to follow the pattern which would bring them a greater chance of happiness. The fact that the mother rather than the father must care for and nourish the girl would seem to account for the greater unhappiness of women in marriage.

The men and women whose parents got along badly were below the average of married happiness. The men and women whose parents had been divorced were a little happier, though distinctly below the average.

The women displayed a smaller sense of inferiority than the men along non-sexual lines. Nine men who reported a fear of sexual inferiority were only half as self-confident along other lines as the rest. Fifteen men who said they once had such a fear but had thrown it off were more self-confident than the average on all points. The self-confidence of both men and women was lower as regards the judgment of other men than of other women. The happily married men and women showed a higher self-confidence grade than the unhappy.

Almost half the women failed to reach in the sex act the explosive climax which is enjoyed by all men. Nearly half these women had developed a psychoneurosis. Only one out of all the rest of the women had a nervous ailment of this kind. The research appeared to show that inability to reach the climax may be to a small extent the result of marriage to inexperienced men, but that it is largely the result of a fear or disgust of sex ingrained into them as little girls. Those whose sex curiosity had been met most frankly and truthfully were the most liable to experience the full satisfaction of sex. Almost all those who were less than six years old when they

learned where babies come from had the climax. Sex aggressions in childhood appeared to block the emotional response to sex if the sex education had been bad, but had little or no effect if the person had been told the truth easily and naturally before the aggression took place. Masturbation seemed to be a consequence rather than a cause of sexual disability in women.

Forty-six of the men were virgins at marriage, against sixty-five of the women. They were more happily married than the rest.

Before marriage a third of the men and a third of the women had had physical relations with the mates they later married. They were below the average of married happiness.

Before marriage twenty-four men and fourteen woman had had physical relations with others than the persons they later married. They were below the average of married happiness.

Twenty-eight men and twenty-four women had committed adultery. They were distinctly less happy than the rest.

Fifty-nine of the men and forty-seven of the women had had illicit relations either before or after marriage. They were below the average of married happiness.

Two-thirds of the adulteresses had never experienced the sexual climax. The men who were either virgins at marriage or had been extremely promiscuous showed the largest percentage of faithful husbands.

In reporting traits that made their mates less attractive sexually the men put the emphasis on physique and the women on disposition.

The men were more inclined than the women to admit that they craved variety of sexual experience.

The proportion of virgin men increased through the years; the proportion of virgin women increased until we reached those born later than 1890. The tendency of the men to have physical relations with their wives before marriage decreased

with lateness of birth. The tendency of the men toward illicit intercourse decreased with each new generation. It decreased in the case of the women too, till we reached those born later than 1890; then it increased and exceeded that of the men by twenty per cent.

The men and women reported 1358 love affairs—about equally divided between the sexes—in which there was a definite affection for the other person but not necessarily any physical intimacy. After marriage almost half of the women and almost a third of the men had felt such attachments for others than their mates. These men and women were much less happily married than the rest.

The women showed the largest number of love affairs between sixteen years of age and twenty; the men, between twenty-one and twenty-five. This corresponds with the earlier physical maturity of women. Both sexes showed an increase in the number of love affairs after forty, the women more markedly than the men. After they passed thirty the men and women showed a marked tendency toward love affairs with much younger people. Those who reported less than six love affairs showed a higher percentage of happy marriages than those reporting more. The happiest women were those whose first love affair had come between twelve and fifteen; the happiest men had come upon their first loves after fifteen.

The loved ones resembled the opposite parent in physique or disposition in only a sixth to a quarter of the love affairs. Where there was a resemblance, the men tended toward the physical, the woman toward the dispositional.

Forty-two men and forty-one women indulged in physical relations with their loved ones without benefit of clergy. These men reported ninety-five such episodes; the women, ninety-six. These men and women were distinctly below the average of married happiness.

BROKEN HOMES *

PAUL POPENOE

Paul Popenoe began his public career in newspaper work in Pasadena and Los Angeles, following his graduation from college. He was lured from this work to make an agricultural expedition with his brother into Persia, bringing back to this country 16,000 date palms to start the infant industry in the vicinity of Indio, California.

In the year 1913 he accepted the invitation to become the editor of the "Journal of Heredity," which position he held until 1917. He then became Executive Secretary to the American Social Hygiene Association.

During the World War he was Assistant to the Chief of the Medical Section Council, and Lieutenant in the Sanitary Corps U. S. A. and on the Staff of the Surgeon General in the Division of Infections. In 1918 he became Captain and director of the Section of Vice and Liquor Control, and was a member of the War Department's Commission on Training Camp Activities.

He is a member of the American Genetic Association, The American Oriental Association, The American Social Hygiene Association, The Eugenics Research Association, The International Gesellschaft für Sexual Forschung, Eugenics Society of U. S. A., American Legion.

At the present time he is the Executive Secretary of The Human Betterment Foundation of Pasadena and the Institute of Family Relations in Los Angeles. For years he has been making a study of the problem of the home and out of that investigation has come a very valuable book, *The Conservation of the Family,* from which the following chapter has been reprinted.

Mr. Popenoe's other volumes are as follows: *Date Growing in the New and Old Worlds; Applied Eugenics; Modern Marriage; Problems of Human Reproduction; Eugenic Sterilization in California.*

THE break-up of homes is generally supposed to be more frequent each year. There is no way of getting at the actual number, for they include many different types, and in some

* From Paul Popenoe's *The Conservation of the Family.* Copyright, 1926, by Williams and Wilkins, republished in this volume with the generous permission both of the publishers and author.

instances the fact that the home is virtually broken is known only to the intimates of those concerned. Broken homes may for the present purpose be roughly classified as follows:

1. Internally broken, but outwardly intact.
2. Outwardly as well as inwardly broken, by
   a. Abandonment, desertion, or non-support;
   b. Separation mutually agreed upon;
   c. Divorce.

In a sense, a home is also broken by the death of husband or wife; but as other members of the family usually rise to the occasion and preserve many of the features of home life, this case will not be discussed in the present section.

Divorce is often thought of as constituting the real problem of broken homes, but this is an error, for it is not the decree of a court that breaks a home: it is the internal conditions. Divorce, therefore, is merely one evidence of the existence of broken homes. Any honest attempt to deal with divorce or any of the other special problems involved must begin at the beginning and inquire what breaks homes, rather than spend time arguing about how, when a home has once been broken irremediably, the fact can best be registered in legal form.

Taking divorce records, however, as the only authentic data on the number of broken homes, it is known that they have been increasing rapidly in the United States—doubling and quadrupling with the decades until there is now a divorce recorded for every seven marriages—a rate higher than that of any foreign country and twice as high as most. To cite only some recent years, the figures are:

YEAR	MARRIAGES	DIVORCES
1916	1,040,684	112,036
1922	1,126,418	148,554
1923	1,223,825	165,139

It will be seen that divorces are still increasing in number more rapidly than marriages. Thus while marriages increased in 1923 over 1922 by eight and four-tenths per cent, divorces increased by eleven per cent. In some states and cities, there is now a divorce for every three, or even every two, marriages.[1]

The problem of broken homes has, as was intimated above, been much obscured by the fact that it was popularly assumed to be equivalent to the problem of divorce, that it was treated almost wholly from the legal and economic sides, and that the atmosphere was clouded by lawyers' technicalities and quibbles over non-support, restitution of conjugal rights, forgiveness and resumption of cohabitation, separation from bed and board, interlocutory decrees, alimony, and so on. These matters are biologically immaterial, and the present treatment will largely ignore them, endeavoring to get down to the biological conditions underlying the break-up of homes. This is the more necessary because the reasons set forth in pleas for divorce are almost never the true reasons. Usually the separating partners lie fluently to suit their own purposes; often they themselves do not know what are the real, fundamental reasons that have caused their matrimonial bark to drift on the rocks. It is high time, therefore, that the point

[1] This form of comparison, which is made by the Census Bureau and widely circulated, is not statistically justifiable. Since a divorce usually follows only after some years of marriage, the number should not be contrasted with the number of marriages in the same year, but with the number of marriages that occurred say five years previously. Moreover, some marriages are terminated by death of one partner, before they have a chance to appear in the divorce record. Both of these sources of error tend to make the divorce rate appear even lower than it is, in comparison with the marriage rate. Again, in many cities and states the number of marriages represents the resident population, while the divorce records are filled with transients, who have come from other states for the sole purpose of divorce. It would be impossible, with the imperfection of American vital statistics, to avoid all the fallacies, and the comparison given above is therefore accepted, with this warning to the reader against taking it at its face value.

of view were changed for a while, and divorce studied from a different angle.

In passing judgment on a marriage, the interests to be considered, in order of importance, are: (1) the welfare of society or of the race, (2) of the children, (3) of husband and wife. The usual view looks in a mirror instead of at the facts, putting the interests of husband and wife paramount and light-heartedly assuming that if their whims are sufficiently consulted, their children and the race will profit accordingly. Reformers of the marriage institution mostly emphasize this tendency, instead of breaking away from it, and their writings are full of impassioned and often persuasive pleas for the sacredness of personal freedom, the immorality of a marriage in which love has died, and the shocking fate of children compelled to live in an inharmonious household. While there is some truth in all this, and the interests of the three are closely inter-related, yet one must adopt a starting point.

Here is a fork of the road. It is necessary for each one to clear his mind, before discussing broken homes, and to take his stand either on the side of the egoists, to whom nothing looms so large as their own pleasure, or on the side of those who believe that only in a strong and progressive society in which children are given first consideration, is the greatest and most lasting happiness of husband and wife, and the greatest welfare of all, to be found.

From the latter standpoint, which is here adopted, the common plea that love is the only justification for marriage, and that when it has ceased to exist, it is worse to compel people to live together than to allow them to separate, requires careful analysis. In the first place, "love" does not mean the same to any two persons. The romantic and highly egoistic idea of love, which is reflected in most present-day literature and art, is a relatively late development in civilization, being

little heard of before the time of the Crusades, when returning knights imported oriental habits of reflection and poetic analysis of love.[2] Many of the people who sing of it so enthusiastically are neurotics. On the other hand, many peo-

[2] The Arabian Nights furnish abundant illustrations of the oriental attitude toward love. An earlier illustration, given by 'Alī ibn Husain al-Masūdī (died about 956 A.D.) in his Murūj al-Dhahab wa Ma'ādin al-Jawāhīr (Meadows of Gold and Mines of Precious Stones) vi, 368ff, is derived from a gathering at the home of Yahyā ibn Khalid al-Barmak, tutor of the Caliph Harūn al-Rashīd. This nobleman proposed to his guests that each should give a summary definition of love.

'Alī ibn al-Haitham: "Love is the fruit of the conformity of species and the index of the fusion of two souls. It emanates from divine beauty, from the pure and subtle principle of substance. Its extent is unlimited; its development a cause of loss to the body."

Abū Malikān of Hadhramaut: "Love is a magic breath; it is more hidden and more incandescent than a live coal in the ashes; it exists only by the union of two souls and the mingling of two forms. It penetrates into and infuses itself into the heart, as the moisture of a fog does into the pores of the earth. It reigns over everything, conquers all intelligences, and commands all wills."

Muhammad ibn al-Hudhail: "Love places its seal on the eyes and its imprint on the heart; it circulates through the body and penetrates to the depths of the entrails. It throws thought into disorder and the intelligence into mobility; with it nothing remains unaltered; no promise binds it; all misfortunes descend on it. Love is a drop dipped from the ocean of death, a swallow taken from the reservoirs of annihilation. But it draws its expansive force from nature itself and from the beauty which resides in all created beings. The man who loves is prodigal, deaf to the appeals of prudence, and insensible to reproaches."

Hishām ibn al-Hakim of Kūfā: "Destiny has made of love a net, from which can escape only hearts that are sincere in misfortune. When a lover falls into its depths and is caught in its meshes, he can never emerge from it safe and sane, nor can he avoid it by flight. Love is born of the beauty of the human figure and of the affinity and sympathy between souls. With it death penetrates to the entrails and to the depths of the heart; the most elegant tongue is frozen; the king becomes a subject, the master becomes a slave and abases himself before the lowest of his servitors.

Ibrahīm ibn Yassar al-Naththām: "Love is more evasive than a mirage, more rapid than wine circulating in the arteries. It is a delicate clay baked in the oven of divine power. So long as it is restrained, its fruits are full of flavor; but if it exceeds its bounds it becomes a mortal madness, a malady whose ravages are terrible and irremediable. Like a cloud, it dissolves in rain on human hearts; there it causes trouble to germinate and brings grief to fruition. The man conquered by love suffers without respite; he even heaves his bosom only with an effort. Paralysis menaces him: constantly plunged in melancholy he passes his

ple are quite incapable of such love, who are nevertheless capable of happy marriage and the successful rearing of a family.

Examination will show that the romantic love on which the advocates of divorce by mutual consent are wont to insist so fervently is essentially the love that is felt in youth—the mating love. But it is absurd to suppose, as the reformers do, that this love can, or should, exist unchanged throughout life. There must be an evolution in the feeling of love, as in other things. In normal human beings the evolution is something like this:

1. The infant loves himself. He is concerned wholly with what he can get out of the world, and seeks continually to gratify himself by getting pleasurable sensations.

2. The child goes a step farther, and begins to love his parents (especially the one of opposite sex); then others who are near to him and from whom he benefits.

3. About the time of puberty, the affections are largely directed toward those of the same sex (i.e., homosexual). This is the age when a boy is loyal to "the gang," while girls often have "crushes" with schoolmates or teachers of the same sex.

4. After the age of puberty, the youth begins to take an interest in the opposite sex outside the family circle. This period of "puppy love" is sometimes painful to bystanders; but so are various other manifestations of adolescence. The period is characterized by normal and acute interest not in a single person of the opposite sex, but in all, though preference is shown for various individuals at various times. It is the age of the flapper, and of flirtation; it is a preparation

---

nights without sleep, his days without peace; grief makes him hungry but he is nourished only by his sighs."

And so on through a long line of other worthies. All this is quite in the modern style, of which one will find very few examples in classical antiquity.

for marriage, in which, by the familiar process of trial and error, the boy or girl is developing the emotional nature, by establishing ideals, and getting ready to mate. It is followed by

5. The period of mating, in which the affections are at last fixed upon a single person, and marriage takes place. Life is now normally suffused with sexual feelings for some years, unless the edge has been taken off this period by premarital incontinence, in which case satiety may manifest itself rapidly. The saying of Alexander Dumas, Jr., that within two weeks after marriage every man feels he has made a mistake in marrying, is not true, but it has an element of truth in it in so far as premarital incontinence followed by rapid satiety in marriage tends to produce a feeling of revulsion.

6. Within a few years, this phase of love is normally enlarged by the arrival of children, and parental love becomes an important part of adult life, the love of the mate not occupying the exclusive place that it did in the previous period. S. T. Coleridge throws a sidelight on this in his *Table Talk* of September 27, 1830. So-and-so, he remarks, "once said that he could make nothing of love, except that it was friendship accidentally combined with desire. Whence I conclude that he was never in love. For what shall we say of the feelings which a man of sensibility has toward his wife with her baby at her breast! How pure from sensual desire! Yet how different from friendship!"

7. As the strength of all physical feelings wanes with advancing age, this sort of love is again gradually broadened into a love for all humanity, which finds its outlet in benevolence and philanthropy, and remains until the end of life, although there is a temporary flare-up of sexual interest at one period (in women, about the menopause; in men, usually between fifty and sixty), as if the organism, realizing that it was rapidly reaching the point where its fundamental pur-

pose of reproduction could no longer be fulfilled, wanted to make the most of its few remaining opportunities. The soberest men and women sometimes become foolish at this point. When a prominent person suddenly breaks into print as a champion of free love, or immerses himself in sexual studies, reference to *Who's Who* nearly always confirms the suspicion that he is at the age of final incandescence.

This evolution of the emotional life, which is here presented in a much simplified and inadequate outline,[8] is of the highest importance in any consideration of happiness in married life. While every normal person goes through this development, the stages are not sharply separated. Moreover, the feelings of no stage are wholly lost; they are merely expanded and subordinated as the next stage is entered. The person who expects to remain all the rest of his life in any one of these stages except the last is either defective or a fool.

There are, nevertheless, all too many cases of arrested development. Many a spoiled child really never gets beyond the first stage, and goes through life trying to force everybody and everything to minister to his own pleasure; indulging in a tantrum or developing symptoms of hysteria when he cannot have his own way. Many another never outgrows the post-adolescent stage: thus the flapper with gray hair, and the elderly male flirt who is constantly trying to make an impression on young women ("No fool like an old fool!") are familiar to all.

Such an analysis simplifies the question of love in marriage. The man or woman who finds, after a few years of married life, that the old thrill is being lost, and who seeks continually to renew it by flirtation or adultery, is simply confessing that he or she is suffering from arrested development—that evolution is not proceeding normally. As a mat-

[8] There are, of course, other points of view from which the same subject may be analysed.

ter of fact, such people have usually never freed themselves from the auto-erotic stage of childhood; marriage means to them merely the opportunity to secure pleasurable sensations. Such individuals are always unhappily mated. When their "love" cools, they feel that they must rekindle the fire by finding a new mate—either legally or illegally; and so continue through life until satiety or physical decline leaves them to seek satisfaction in salacious fiction or in the bald-headed row at "leg shows."

Is it necessary to remold the institution of marriage, merely to gratify the auto-erotic cravings of these cases of arrested development? Would it not be saner to alter modern educational methods in such a way as to permit these people to go through the normal course of development, which ends by building up a home full of children that radiates altruism into all the activities of life?

Before agreeing, then, to the cant phrase that it is immoral for two people to continue to live together when love has ceased to exist between them, one must inquire just what love means in this connection. No one can or should continue long in the intense, auto-erotic form of "love" that neurasthenics and reformers have in mind; and many people (perhaps most, if the whole world is considered) who are capable of happy marriage and successful parenthood, are not capable of any such introspective expression of love.

In some ways it would be preferable to turn the statement around, and to say that marriage is immoral if hatred exists between the partners. But this is largely subject to control. The selfish, fickle, and feebly-inhibited will always give trouble in this respect. Marriage cannot be "factory rebuilt" for such defectives. Some people never find happiness in marriage, no matter how many times they try their luck; the same people often never find happiness in work or in anything else. Happiness simply is not in them. Is it not

time to realize that persons so constituted cannot adjust to any adult situation? And is it not stupid to talk of remaking the mores for the benefit of a small minority who are hopeless anyhow, really of defective mental constitution? If there is a remedy for this evil, it is in early training, mental hygiene, and biological education, not in trial marriage or easy divorce.

An analysis of love, then, suggests the solution to many problems of broken homes. Here again, it is found that society is at work, in its usual way, to settle the problem at the wrong end—to wail over the consequences instead of removing the causes. Any movement to prevent broken homes by such measures as trial marriage and divorce by mutual consent is a crime against the race unless it is at the same time accomplished by a much more vigorous effort to remove the causes of broken homes.

Approaching a little nearer to individual broken homes, it will be found that at the bottom of most of them (some students have said ninety per cent or more) there is the fundamental problem of sexual maladjustment. People who are perfectly adjusted to each other in this respect do not seek separation, either by desertion or divorce. This fact frequently does not transpire in cases of publicity—frequently, indeed, discordant partners themselves do not realize just what the trouble is. But lawyers and judges who hear many divorce petitions know that this is the truth. It is safe to say that sexual maladjustment plays a part in almost every divorce, and that it is the most important factor in a majority, even though not known to be such by the parties concerned. Could anything be more illogical than the present policy of society, to (1) let people marry in ignorance, (2) let them divorce because of this ignorance, and (3) then let them, still ignorant, make new matings, many of which will be broken up in the same way and for the same reason?

Obviously, here is one of the strategic points for an attack against the evil. A clearer understanding of what love really means, a better preparation for marriage on the part of both men and women, more deliberate and carefully considered mating, and clinics which, when necessary, could furnish enlightenment concerning particular problems, would do more to abate the evil than all legal reforms put together.

Beyond this, there are of course innumerable minor problems, legal, economic, social, and what not, which require study and action. To discuss these fully would both be outside the province of this book, and unnecessary, because these are precisely the phases of the whole question that are already getting attention—much more than they deserve, in comparison with the fundamental issues. It is worth noting, in passing, that marriages in which husband and wife are of different race or nationality figure preponderantly in the divorce record; and that to a large extent divorce is sought by those who have neither children nor property to hold them together. In a study of divorce petitions filed in Minneapolis, Mildred D. Mudgett found that half of the applicants were clients of some charitable agency, and most of the families had court records for one cause or another—one family had appeared in all the courts of the city, a total of twenty-eight times, another twenty-one, and so on down. There is a great danger in looking at the mass statistics of divorce, and becoming alarmed over them, without analyzing them to find just what sort of people contribute them. It is known that both the delinquent rich and the delinquent poor appear in large ratio in the records of all forms of broken homes. Is the institution of monogamy to be remodeled for the benefit of these two classes, or is some other remedy more appropriate?

Even after the necessary changes have been made, so that people will have a wider choice in marriage, be educated to

choose more wisely, and understand the physiology and psychology of love, there will remain enough cases of broken homes to require some sort of court action. As to desertion, abandonment, non-support, and the like, the obvious thing to do is to bring back the departing partner and, by social case work or law enforcement, to adjust the difficulty in some more intelligent and effective way than is involved where a man or woman merely packs and departs, leaving no address.

For such cases, and for all divorce cases filed, there should be clinics, to which reference will be made in the first instance. Here investigation would often remove causes of misunderstanding and friction (particularly if due to ignorance about love and marriage), and the matrimonial ship might start again on its course in a smoother sea. Even today, humane lawyers and intelligent judges, though little qualified for the attempt, succeed in effecting many reconciliations.

The requirements in some states that all applications for divorce be published and all hearings be public has been harmful. Under these conditions of pitiless publicity both parties bow their necks and are not in a mood to consider reconciliation—self-esteem is too much injured. Mutual consent and collusion, which, under present laws, are unlimited sources of fraud and deceit, may make such publicity necessary, but it would probably be just as effective if the facts were made public only six months after a divorce is granted, and not published at all when a divorce is denied. The break-up of many homes that are only slightly cracked would thereby be prevented.

Certainly it is an outrage that a biological question should be made a matter of typical police court procedure, with shyster lawyers ranting and bullying the witnesses for the edification of eager spectators. It is hard to see why lawyers

properly have any business at all in such a matter. A Court of Domestic Relations, with its own investigators and the routine assistance of a competent clinic, should handle all problems involving broken homes, and lawyers should not be permitted to make a living by exploiting family differences. Since they get a fee for securing a divorce, and nothing for effecting a reconciliation, it is too much to expect that they will be as much interested in the latter as in the former result. Many—to their honor—do seek, and often effect, reconciliations, but they are not specially qualified for such an effort and should be superseded by those who are better trained for the attempt. The situation is worsened by the fact that divorce practice is either in the hands of young attorneys, who have to take anything they can get in order to live, or of men who are not the most reputable in the profession. The average lawyer with self-respect and high standards despises divorce work and will not take it if he can avoid it.

From the foregoing, it ought to be clear that "mutual consent" is not an adequate excuse for the break-up of a home. In many cases incompatibility can be cured by re-education more satisfactorily than by divorce. Grounds that are really valid, from a eugenic viewpoint, include such as insanity or other serious mental disability, chronic alcoholism, long imprisonment for crime, and extreme cruelty or other evidence that the offender is not normal. In these cases the innocent partner should be given an opportunity to establish a new home and contribute children to society, while the offending one should be prevented from future reproduction.

At first sight it would appear that no grounds could commend themselves more to a biologist than infertility and impotence. But neither case is so simple as it may seem.

Fritz Lenz has pointed out that if infertility were admitted without question, in petitions for divorce, the way would be open to unlimited abuse. People could cohabit for a time,

with contraception or abortion, and then ask for divorce on the ground that the union was childless: it would be extremely difficult to disprove their claim.

Impotence in man is often wholly mental in origin, due to his own wrong education or that of his wife. Reference to a clinic is the correct procedure.

In sum, the attempt to deal with broken homes by the customary legal palliatives is limited in its usefulness. Whatever is done, there should be uniform legislation, instead of the present chaotic condition in which each state makes different requirements. But the real hope for success is in prevention rather than cure. It is foolish to waste time on a "divorce problem." The real problem is to prevent unhappy marriages by (1) better education for marriage and (2) better selection of mates. After all this, if there are still difficulties, a clinic can do much. The actual legal registration of the fact of a broken home is the least of all problems. If the energy now directed toward getting "reforms" in the divorce laws were directed for a time toward making marriage more carefully considered and intelligently entered, the results would be surprising.

THE WILL TO LOVE *

ELIZABETH C. ADAMS

Mrs. Adams, the daughter of James Challas Parsons, a Unitarian clergyman and a writer of philosophy, was brought up in the atmosphere of a Unitarian school for girls at Greenfield, Massachusetts. Her mother was a highly cultured, brilliant, versatile, and self-forgetful woman. At seventeen, Mrs. Adams entered Radcliffe College as a special student and spent, as she says, "two rather irresponsible years enjoying those studies which I liked and avoiding those that bored me." At nineteen the college career and two incipient romances were cut short and decisively by the appearance on the scene of a young Harvard instructor, Comfort Avery Adams, to whom she was married a year later.

The following article, "The Will to Love," was published in the *Atlantic Monthly* in February, 1924, and was the fruit of the rich experience of many years with her husband and two sons, John and Clayton. Her other published work includes a small volume of verse called *The Street Car and the Star.*

HAVING examined with eager interest the *Atlantic's* exhibit of thoughtful opinions on the subjects of marriage and divorce, I find myself wondering why no one of the contributors to this vitally important discussion has asked seriously whether love between a man and a woman can or cannot be induced. This to me is the heart of the whole problem. On its answer hangs, as I shall hope to show, the answer to the divorce question.

It is customary to begin any discussion of marriage and divorce by assuming the desirability of uninterrupted family life, other things being equal. Even the present rising generation hesitates to contradict when one says that a man and

* Published in the February, 1924, *Atlantic Monthly,* and reprinted with the courteous consent of both author and publisher.

wife should keep together if possible. The world sees that a nation of stable homes is a stable nation, and that children of such homes grow up into stalwart generations of men. The new President of Radcliffe College, Ada Louise Comstock, in her inaugural address declared that a large proportion of the dullards she had encountered in her years as an educator came from homes wherein divorce was either actual or imminent.

What the modern mind mainly questions is whether a child is not better off in a home frankly broken than in one that is full of cracks merely puttied over to give the appearance of wholeness. If any home could be doomed to remain forever in such a parlous condition, few of us, I think, would choose to be one of its inmates, and only the most rigid disciplinarian would consign a child to such an atmosphere. The question which I raise is, need ever so cracked a domestic structure remain in that condition? In other words, has man or has he not the will to love?

Writing on the subject of divorce in a recent *Atlantic*, Mrs. Gerould calls it a cynical point of view which holds that "almost any two people who have once chosen to come together will be as happy in that as in any other combination." To my mind this is the only point of view which is not cynical, for it is the only one that takes it for granted that man has dominion over his own thinking and feeling. With it, to my mind, stands or falls the whole question of the rightness of divorce.

If it were wholly impossible for two persons to control their feelings for each other, marriages would rarely remain happy for longer than five or six years at best, and we might well form our laws to render divorce as easy as marriage.

That it is not impossible to foster love for one's wife or husband is being proved every day by thousands of thoughtful men and women, who, though more or less disillusioned

as to the angelic nature of their partners in marriage, or at least as to the Heaven-made fitness of the match, have turned their attention to whatsoever things are lovely in each other, with the result that a new understanding and respect and even tenderness have grown up between them.

It may be claimed that only certain types of minds can perform such feats as this: that the highly organized, temperamental, passionate, or emotional man or woman is helpless before spontaneous feeling.

Who has not seen such miracles brought to pass, however, in the case of husbands and wives so temperamentally different that they seemed to speak in different tongues? By patient, kindly observance of each other's discernible lovely traits, and faith in the loveliness that lurks undiscovered in all created beings, these believers in themselves have finally built up a comradeship fit for the foundation of the best possible home.

That one or both of these persons might not have experienced more rapturous moments of happiness with more like-minded mates, I am not interested to dispute; but is it at all sure that, year in and year out, through periods of the children's teething, or the bank account's running low, or missing trains, there would have been, even in the case of the most Heaven-made mates, a tale of uninterrupted joy?

In ancient India there was no choosing of mates, and yet, such was the sense of the duty of loving taught at the mother's knee—not only of the duty, but of the beauty of loving—that the young husband and wife usually managed to make a very good piece of work of idealizing each other, so that mutual respect and tenderness formed the atmosphere of home life in early unconquered India.

In our own day, we have William James showing the possibility of the will to believe, which is an essential and sure step to the will to love; and we have Dr. Richard Cabot, in

his chapter on marriage in *What Men Live By,* setting the true standard for good sportsmanship in marriage relations. A good sport, he shows, will take pride in succeeding in any adventure, and marriage is only one of life's adventures.

But how about the passionate element in love between the sexes, someone may ask. Can a man or woman be happy without it, and can children be richly endowed where it is lacking at their conception? Although I have seen homes that were happy without the presence of this element, I know that there are many writers on the subject, including the Swedish individualist, Ellen Key, who are unwilling to concede the possible perfectness of a home or joyousness of its children if passion enters not at all into the relation of the husband and wife.

To these I can say that I believe even this commonly considered involuntary feeling can grow out of the increased understanding, hence tenderness and attachment, that two intelligent, sympathetic persons can build up for each other on a basis of faith in God and in man.

Please note that I speak of the attachment that two persons can build up, as I doubt if a really close and tender comradeship can be established unless both of those concerned see the goal and are willing to try for it.

This does not mean that one would like to see society go back to the customs of early India and arrange marriages with no regard to mutual attraction; but it does mean that, the step to marriage once taken, one would like to see in the parties to it more of the attitude of the good sport, who never gives up until he has not only tried all the ordinary human methods, but also has set a higher standard of methods for saving the day. In the case of marriage, it would mean saving the day for homes of beautiful living and reliable loving.

That there should be some provision for failure in such an

adventure, there seems to be no doubt, though I should like to see the granting of divorce based on the condition that neither party to it has another specific mate in mind. That a man or woman can make a thoroughly sincere try at learning to love the established partner, while having the attention diverted by a counter-attraction, is too much to expect. It simply cannot be done, unless the attracting outsider is definitely and irrevocably dismissed from the mind as a possible mate.

If the story and scenario writers could be induced to cease a while in their glorification of the thrill of love at first sight, and be brought to show instead the glory of love attained through good sportsmanship, might not the number of divorces, with their trail of heartaches, miserable, faith-robbed children, and weak men and women, be considerably lessened? Much more effective than such a reform, however, would be an enlightened revival of the Indian mother's custom of teaching her children the power of the spirit and the glory of man's dominion over his inner kingdom.

This is surprisingly easy, even with very little children. The Indian mother drew on the rich storehouse of the Ramayana for models of loyalty and strength; but if the modern Occidental mother knows some of the best fairy tales, or the legends of the Round Table, she can fortify the young hearts of her children with many an indelible picture of faith triumphant over all evil suggestions.

When all men come to be so fortunate as to learn thus at a mother's knee something of the science of living and the art of loving, we shall have gone toward eradicating the tendency to divorce, because we shall have struck its root, materialistic selfishness, and shall have planted in its place the will to love.

THE EVOLUTION OF LOVE *

TOYOHIKO KAGAWA

Toyohiko Kagawa is unquestionably the outstanding Christian in Asia and the man of most commanding, single personal influence in Japan. From one who was persecuted and imprisoned by the government because of his social ideals and his espousal of the cause of the working man, he has become the most potent influence of the government in developing industrial peace and good will in the Empire.

He is primarily a preacher and a teacher. He lived for years in one of the worst slum districts in Kobe, a place where eleven thousand people occupied eleven blocks; as many as nine people sleeping in a room six feet square! Kagawa saw that something more than preaching was needed in such a neighborhood and when he was twenty-two years of age, not yet thoroughly recovered from tuberculosis, he began there the work of love and service that crystallized his life philosophy and made him so completely identified in supporting and understanding the problems of poverty and moral lapse. As a result he has become a world figure, a symbol of Christ living in the twentieth century.

After four and a half years in the slums, Kagawa came to this country and attended classes at Princeton. Upon his return to Japan he went back to the slums to live, and until 1923, when his first child was born, lived there. During this time he contracted trachoma from a man with whom he shared his bed, and has at intervals suffered complete loss of sight.

His work is prodigious. He is not only a pastor of several churches, preaching from six to a dozen times a week, but he is a builder of schools and an organizer of labor unions. He is a prolific author. He is a member of innumerable committees and commissions on social welfare. His life is a challenge to those who live in indolence and ease.

The following chapters are taken from his recent book, *Love, The Law of Life,* in which he weaves the love motif into all the fabrics of life ranging from love and sex, through love and government; love and economics, to love and my neighbor, love and God. Love, he insists, is

---

* The following chapters on "Love and Sexual Desire," "Love and Romance," "Love and Marriage," are taken from Kagawa's recent book *Love the Law of Life,* published by the John C. Winston Company, Phila., 1929, and reprinted with their kind permission. Copyright, 1929, by the John C. Winston Company, copyright in Great Britain, the British Dominions and Possessions, copyright in Philippine Islands.

higher than sexual desire. Love is a marvelous thing—it includes within itself end and means and motive. Love's single stroke does double duty. When one has said, "I love him," one has helped, not only one's self but one's fellow as well. He is the author of six books of poems written out of his heartbreaking experiences in the slums. His most famous book is unquestionably *Crossing the Death Line,* an autobiographical essay in partly novelized form.

Love and Sexual Desire

The Tendency to Treat Sexual Desire from the Religious Standpoint

In laborer-peasant Russia in the May Day Procession, it is said that one group marched with a crown and a Bible bound to a gun-carriage. In their view, materialists as they are, all social conditions and economic life are immediately to be reformed by revolution, and therefore there is no need to give thought to such things as religion, morality, or conscience. Christianity, in particular, which teaches revolution by change of the inner life, they regard as too tepid, and hence injurious and unprofitable.

Thus one school of socialists ignores religion and proclaims a new morality, while on the other hand another school stoutly insists that religion is not to be ignored. The latter school gives us greater surprise, for they comprise a group of students of sex who might naturally be imagined materialistic. Sir Francis Galton, nephew of Darwin, in his *Study of Human Capacities,* taught that love and sex morality must be religiously motivated; and Karl Pearson, the biological statistician, who succeeded Galton, has pointed out the impossibility of reforming sexual morality except by the power of religion.

Bloch, who made encyclopedic researches in sex problems, in his *Modern Sexual Life* observes in his scholarly way that sex life must depend upon religion. Ellen Key, critic of feminist problems, explains that the solution of sex love lies in religion. Havelock Ellis, investigator of sex psychology,

in his *Scheme of Social Hygiene* declares that humanity cannot progress unless sex love is purified by religion; and, according to Forel, "Sexual desire can be controlled by religion: that is the true sex life." Such a tendency, even apart from the standpoint of completed religious systems such as Christianity and Buddhism, is a matter for thorough study. The fact that religion, which, from the point of view of the materialistic ethics, should be abandoned, is on the contrary welcomed, or rather invited, by authorities in sex problems, is indeed a remarkable phenomenon. The reason for it we shall consider primarily from the standpoint of Christianity, which allows the sexual life.

Jesus and the Problem of Sexual Desire

Jesus was not a student of sex problems. Yet Jesus, two thousand years ago, states just as clearly as do the sex scholars of today, that the sex life must be a religious matter. Let us first consider Jesus' teachings relating to sex problems. When we read the New Testament, we find that Jesus in the "Sermon on the Mount" gave a new interpretation of sexual morality, basing it upon his own experience. "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery. But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." [1] Thus in the Authorized Version; but in the Revised Japanese Version, the latter part reads: "Anyone cherishing lustful desire when looking at a woman has already committed adultery with her in his heart." That is to say, the older translation appeared to be a caution against arousing lustful thoughts by looking at a woman, but in the new translation Jesus' words are a warning against cherishing lustful feeling when looking at a woman, that is, a warning against harboring lustful feelings in one's motives.

[1] Matthew 5:27, 28.

However, in any case, Jesus made the ancient admonition against adultery more comprehensive, teaching that adultery may even be secretly committed within a man's heart.

Furthermore, in the same connection Jesus spoke regarding marital life. He by no means negated sex, as do the "Holy Men" of India. "It used to be said, Whoever divorces his wife must give her a divorce certificate. But I tell you, anyone who divorces his wife for any reason except unchastity makes her an adulteress; and whoever marries a divorced woman commits adultery." [2] Whereas, under the ancient law (Deuteronomy 24) a man could, whenever he so desired, write a divorce certificate and send his wife away even for the mere reason that he did not like her, Jesus taught that a man who divorced his wife for any cause except illicit intercourse made her an adulteress and anyone who married her an adulterer.

Jesus, who thus gave new commands against lust in regard to marriage, also taught a new morality of love: "But from the beginning, when God created the world, 'Male and female, He created them: hence a man shall leave his father and mother, and the pair shall be one flesh.' So they are no longer two but one flesh. What God has joined, then, man must not separate." [3]

Sexual Desire, Love and Marriage

Men are generally liable to confuse the three things, sexual desire, love, and marriage. But they differ and must be clearly distinguished. Sexual desire is instinctive, impulsive. In love there is an added psychical element, or, in other words, love has a more personal quality. Marriage is the incorporation of these two things, giving them their proper setting in the social system.

When Jesus said, "Anyone cherishing lustful desire when

[2] *Ibid.*, 5:31, 32. [3] Mark 10:6-9.

looking at a woman has already committed adultery with her in his heart," he implied that when a man looked at a woman with lustful feelings, completely disregarding her inner life of the spirit, even though he had no intercourse with her, he was already in his heart an adulterer. In other words, the man who regards a woman as if she were soulless, bereft of personality, commits the sin of adultery. Sexual desire as it is bought and sold in the streets can exist apart from the personalities and souls of the partners. With this sexual desire alone neither true love nor marriage is possible. Sexual desire and love must be clearly differentiated. Behold the prostitutes of Japan! Do they not frequently exclaim, "We may sell our flesh, but we don't sell our souls?" Even women such as they clearly make the distinction between soul and sexual desire, and they know that love is not lust. True, indeed, love is not lust. When one loves, one does not look with lustful eyes at one of the opposite sex: one rises above base passion.

Love is new life. In primitive times, when humanity had not entered upon its consciously personal life, there was no love: it was for the most part only sexual desire, and women were bought and sold for gold. This ancient practice still persists in certain uncivilized communities. Among the lower classes of Chinese in Formosa the man who wishes to marry a girl must pay money to her parents over a long period to meet the expenses of the girl's rearing. There were times when plunder marriage was practiced: men made sudden attacks, seized the girls they wanted, and carried them off. In such cases there could be no love; there was merely sexual desire, for the purpose of perpetuating the family line.

It is believed by certain people that, as in the ancient periods of communal life love also was communal, so in the future when a communistic society is established, love will again be communal; but such thinking is seriously in error.

In so-called communal societies people lived in groups, and in order to prevent the extirpation of the group sundry irregular practices were resorted to. There were even instances of the propagation of a group by intercourse between fathers and daughters.[4] Practices of this nature were dictated by sexual desire as well as for the purpose of maintaining the group. Pure love could not develop under such conditions. Love was not communal, for love did not exist!

The Germ of Conscience and Sexual Desire

With the passing of the ages, however, and the emergence of the life of conscience, there began choice, selection, between the sexes; and love was born on the earth. In these days of capitalism men can, if they wish, satisfy their sexual cravings with money in the segregated districts. There is no necessity of choice of a mate there: selfish satisfaction of lust is the sole aim. But there is no love in such places. Love comes only when men advance to the point of seeking better mates. Love is born when the sexual life is refined and made personal. In love there must be the selection of a mate. If by love is meant that searching of the matured soul for a mate whose spirit harmonizes most intimately with it, then love must be conceded to be the most recent event in human evolution. This holy love was not achieved prior to the coming of Christ's moral standard upon the earth.

Jesus said, "What God hath joined together, let not man separate." That is to say, love is devotion to one alone. Before Jesus came, but few marriages were monogamous. Polygamy and gregarious marriages prevailed. The principle of monogamy was first established by Jesus. Investigating the history of sex, we find that marital unions have been of many varieties. Every imaginable form of marriage has been

[4] *E.g.*, Genesis, 19.

practiced; and most of these forms have become obsolete in recent times. With the growth of the human soul one form, marriage by selection, has survived, and this is the modern evolution of love. Hence, we must regard love as the outcome of the last two thousand years of human development. During the Middle Ages especially, Christian love developed the code of chivalry, and woman was elevated to a place next to Deity. Respect was paid to her to a degree unknown in any other age.

We are to regard love not as something gross, but as the selection of personality. Marriage is the system socially and legally recognized for the purpose of perpetuating this love. In other words, marriage is the compact of love which society accepts. Jesus said that a man was not to divorce his wife except for unchastity, meaning that divorce was to be resorted to solely in cases of illegal union. Yet if men made a closer study and gained a clearer understanding of the thought of Jesus, there would actually be no occurrence of divorce. For, if men followed the idea of Jesus, marriage would be established upon a basis of personality and character—in other words, upon love. If, on the contrary, marriage comes about from sexual desire alone, it lacks the element of choice and hence, quite as a matter of course, selection will be made after the marriage.

Monogamy must not be thought of as a relation of rigid restraint. The way of true choice is one: if two spirits are ardent, they are no longer two, but one. The more thoroughly quickened conscience becomes, the purer grows the love, and the two hearts unite as one. It is an interesting fact that the conclusions of the quickened conscience and the decisions dictated by sex tend to coincide the one with the other.

The more we consider it, the more marvelous becomes the emergence of sex. The existence of the two creatures, man

and woman, is full of mystery: while their hearts and blood vessels are the same, their sex organs alone differ. How inscrutable it all is! Who can say that he fathoms the depths of this mystery?

The Problem of Plant Sex

Until I studied the evolution of sex in plants, I had never thought at all in regard to this point. Think, for instance, of the stamens and pistils of plants. Would any person looking at them entertain foul thoughts? In plants of low orders reproduction takes place only by fission of cells: there is no distinction of sex. In a willow branch there is no differentiation of sex: it is thrust into the earth, it grows into another tree. The lily grows from a red lobe at the bottom of the leaf. But in the case of the maidenhair tree (*gingko biloba*) the process is changed: the sex differentiation is made and the pollen is carried from the male to the female by the agency of the wind. It is truly marvelous. Among the gymnosperms there are no beautiful blossoms, but when the plants reach the flowering stage, sex-differentiation is created and marvelous functions are revealed. There are, of course, cases in which these functions operate within a single plant, and also those in which the operation is through two or more plants. At any rate, we cannot but think of the mysterious hand of God which created this difference of sex.

Plant reproduction in which the wind and insects are utilized to carry pollen between plants of the same species, has come about because with pollination limited to flowers on the same stalk there is no satisfactory evolution. Plants evolve best where the life is gregarious. The morning glory and the chrysanthemum have stamens and pistil in a single flower. So in order to make them produce beautiful flowers, it is necessary to have them grow gregariously.

Considering the evolution of plants, we learn that the

more beautiful the flowers, the stronger the plant. For such a plant blooms in any environment. Plants which, like moss, do not flower, are weak. There are some plants which have their roots directly under the flowers; and others which after pollination have only their roots left. There are also plants which flower on the sea bottom, and among these are plants which rapidly send up a portion which floats and blooms above the surface of the water.

According to Scott, the evolution of flowering plants is of many forms. The lovely cactus flower blooms in the deserts. This flower is really a metamorphosed leaf which blooms at the tips of the large cactus lobes. There is also a plant which flowers only once in fifty years—the dragon flower, which blooms, drops its seeds, withers, and does not bloom again for fifty years.

Thus, plants which bloom in the deserts, on sea bottoms, and on high mountains, all produce beautiful flowers; and the reason is, that there is selection among them. For life which is contented merely with satisfying sexual desire and securing selfish comfort, does not evolve and cannot become sturdy. In order to grow strong, old traditions and customs must be abandoned, and selection adopted. Applying this principle to mankind, it means that man must enter upon the life of the spirit. Unless his conscience is quickened, man will not rise. Thus it is that many authorities in the science of sex, though opposed to Christianity itself, yet insist that sexual desire must be purified by religion.

Married Life and Economic Pressure

If a marriage results in the birth of children, a home is formed. In ancient times there were families, but no real homes. Jesus said, "A man shall leave his parents and the two shall be one flesh"; but leaving one's parents is not a practice applicable to our country. As parents usually adopt

the young man who marries their daughter, or secure a wife for their son, the young couple become one without leaving the parents. This is the family system, which quite differs from the institution of home.

What we need to notice especially is the fact that love gives way before economic and other external conditions. Sexual desire inclines toward the place of lowest resistance, and there are occasions when kindness and sexual desire are confused. But sexual desire is not food, or kindness, or sympathy. The declaration of socialists that the married life of today suffers under the pressure of the food problem, and their demand that society be emancipated from this economic pressure, are truly reasonable. The condition of many women is no better than that of *geisha* or prostitutes: these women are, in effect, long-term prostitutes, kept by men, like the dolls that are set up on a red carpet at the Doll Festival. To fly out, in spirit, from such a doll's house is home indeed.

Tolstoy declared that a husband could commit adultery even against his wife, if he failed to love her soul and loved only her sex. Therefore, in order to escape such a fearful poisoning of the life of conscience, every one must place his life under the sway of conscience, and thus refine sexual love and marriage. At the same time, as I have already remarked, it is important to avoid confusing sympathy and kindness with sexual love.

The Meaning and the Method of the Life of Stoicism

Let us observe that while on the one hand there are those who freely indulge their sexual desires, there are many who practice the ascetic life. Origen, the great philosopher of the early Christian Church, considering the sexual life sinful, emasculated himself. Members of the Zuboa sect, whom Tolstoy respected, also resorted to this means of control.

The priests of the Greek Orthodox Church and of the Roman Catholic Church live celibate lives. Thomas More was vexed by a growing sexual urge and restrained it by wearing a garment woven of horsehair. But such forms of stoicism control only the flesh: they are of no avail for controlling the spirit, and are therefore wrong.

It is said English and American young people who have received higher education exhibit qualitative changes in their sex life. Women university students in America are said to be subject to various grave dangers as the result of their ascetic life. Women, by virtue of lactation, differ from men, and according to statistics in America, women receiving higher education and leading perfectly ascetic lives till the age of twenty-four or twenty-five, thereafter frequently engage in some profession, while only forty per cent of the graduates marry. The number of children born to the latter averages only two each. Hence, we hear the cry that in America the superior stocks are disappearing. According to an investigation made at Harvard University, male students also as a rule lead continent lives. In general, when men are progressing in the development of character, the control of sexual passion is not particularly difficult. By active participation in sports and by hard study a man can conquer sexual desire. When I was working in the Kobe slums, devoting myself as a friend to the poor, I was able absolutely to repress sexual desire. Mencius tells of the strong self-control of Ryu-ka-kei, who slept under the same mosquito net with a beautiful girl but did not feel the slightest sexual desire.

Jesus had many women friends. There were Mary of Magdala, Mary and Martha of Bethany, Johanna, Suzanna, and Salome. But never has a sex scandal involving Jesus been suggested.

By emasculation alone a sin of the heart cannot be

cleansed; nor can atonement be made by cutting off one's finger. True emasculation is that of the soul.

When the Olympic games flourished in Greece, youths and maidens raced together in almost complete nudity. When man leads a natural life, he does not degenerate easily. When engaged in active, beautiful movements, sensual feelings do not arise.

Davy, the inventor of the miner's safety lamp, set the date for his wedding, but he was so engrossed in his work that he forgot the matter of the wedding entirely. His fiancée's wrath was aroused, the engagement was broken, and Davy remained a bachelor all his life. When a person works diligently at invention or research, he can overcome all degenerate impulses.

Jesus lived a single man not because he felt compelled to remain single, but because he freely chose that plan. Paul, disciple of Christ, advocated celibacy because of his idea of the appproaching end of the world. He thought that in a time of distress it might be better to be single; but in my view this matter must be left entirely to the discretion of each individual. Those who marry do not do wrong. The only question is, are they refining the relation by love and by conscience?

Love and Romance

Monogamous Love

A vigorous movement known as the New Feminism, which is opposed to the principle of monogamy, has sprung up in many quarters. In what is known as Free Love there may be economic as well as psychic and social elements, but the majority of its exponents speak from the standpoint of the abolition of strict monogamy. But the monogamy of Christianity is a principle born of long experience in sex morality, and is not the product of a fleeting phantasy. Ellen

Key and other feminists appear to have adopted the daring position of approving a kind of polygamy with a new import, derived from the realm of female sex-instinct, but I cannot approve of it. Ellen Key's theory, from the standpoint of race-betterment, may be admirable; but viewed in the light of the psychic requirements of human beings, it has within it extremely dangerous elements.

The Theory of Polygamy

According to the contention of Ellen Key, in situations where the number of males is exceeded by the number of females, there develops—as the consequence of woman's desire to fulfil the demands of sex, which she as well as man possesses—an intense urge to give birth to children. In such a situation, provided the woman's character is kept unsullied, it is not necessarily wrong for her to receive the impregnation of a superior man. According to the history of biology, when the number of males of a species is smaller than the number of females, the species shows a tendency to increase; yet the opposite tendency, too, is not infrequently to be observed. That is, when the number of females is less than the number of males, it may happen that polyandry, rather than polygamy, will appear. When a species suffers an insufficiency of food, these tendencies may be exhibited. Since the desire to help maintain the species develops instinctively within the individual, artificial restraints become impotent; conscious impulse breaks down artificial morality, and leads even to what seems to be immorality. For example, there appear in the Old Testament such cases as those of Lot who had children by his daughters, and of Abraham who planned to maintain his family line by concubinage. Judged by present-day standards these instances appear immoral, but regarded from the standpoint of biologic evolution and with due consideration of the environment of the

period and the circumstances of the cases, we cannot denounce such acts as sinful. Hence, reasoning in the same way in the situations proposed by Ellen Key, when the number of females is absolutely greater than that of the males, and when the sexual demand, too, is absolute, I cannot deny that her theory has, in view of these two conditions alone, some basis of reason. However, such situations cannot be viewed in the absolute, and will be sanctioned only in a morality allowed in special circumstances in biologic evolution. In situations where the numbers of males and females are practically equal, where there is no economic restraint, but full freedom for them to fall in love with each other, then I am unable to say whether or not that will be a period when the possibility of monogamy can be admitted.

I consider rather, in that situation, that monogamy supplies the foundation for a true social system. If we regard only the matter of sexual passion, both polygamy and polyandry have ample logical foundations; but just proportional to the advance of civilization is the urgency, not alone for the so-called preservation of the race, but for the perfecting of the individual. The development of monogamy in Christianity is entirely the result of the consciousness of individuality. Hence, where men think only of the preservation of the race and lack this consciousness of complete individuality, there is in their views, nothing more stupid than the institution of monogamy. May it not be that Ellen Key's adventurous theory of love places somewhat too great an emphasis upon the matter of race?

The Evolution of Marriage Since the Beginning of the Meiji Era

The romantic love of the Middle Ages developed, of course, from extreme individualism, from the idea that love could exist apart from body and that bodily contact was

degrading. It was even thought that love and celibacy could exist side by side. Love such as that between Francis of Assisi and Clara was, in its mystical nature, the model of the Middle Ages. But it must be said that their relation was quite out of the ordinary. Hence, when to our concern for preserving the species we add the ideal of the perfecting of the individual, we are inevitably led to adopt the plan of monogamy.

This becomes very clear when we study the evolution of marriage in Japan during and since the Meiji Era. The people, being partial to the family system and placing emphasis upon blood lineage, used to approve the system of concubinage. But along with the self-awakening of the individual, there came the development of woman's education, and the self-awakening of woman eventually accomplished the complete over-throw of polygamy. Toward this result ethical influences from Europe and America doubtless contributed, but the fundamental fact was not the influence of an imported morality. Rather, I wish to affirm that it was the compelling power of woman's self-awakening. In the twentieth year of Meiji (1888) there were forty divorces to every hundred marriages, but at present the rate is only one-fourth as large, namely, ten per cent. For this phenomenon we can assign absolutely no other reason than the self-awakening of woman. Of course, Japan is still notorious for its high divorce rate; yet, in my view, when Japanese women develop to the point of choosing their husbands, the divorce rate will be still further reduced.

The Extraordinary Increase of Divorces in the United States

In contrast to the decrease of divorces in Japan there is the phenomenon of the rising rate of divorce in the United States. In recent years the rate has increased enormously, a fact which shows that monogamy is really difficult of prac-

tice throughout a whole lifetime. Then why has the divorce rate in the United States increased so greatly? In attempting to analyze the causes, one may surmise first that since the women of the United States have such great freedom, they enter into wedlock too lightly, often driven by vanity or the ardor of some passing emotion and failing to anticipate any of the difficulties of home making or the birth of children. That is to say, the rise of the divorce rate in America may be ascribed to sentimental love—a love that is too scanty, too selfish, failing to admit the responsibility that love bears toward all humankind, and caring absolutely nothing for the continuation of the family line. These people marry because it is interesting, and when the interest wanes, they separate.

In short, love which proceeds with no aim of perfecting the individual characters has no prospect whatever of becoming perfected as a monogamous union. In such situations, even though the law forbids irregular intimacies, it will not be obeyed.

Monogamy and the Perfecting of Individual Character

Is monogamy, then, an erroneous principle? By no means. Apparent failures of monogamy rather serve as proof that the individuals concerned were not advancing toward perfection and were unable to accept the principle of monogamy. In fine, the principle of monogamy arises neither from physiologic racialism nor from sentimental individualism. Monogamy is possible only when love has progressed to an intensity wherein the two natures are aflame through and through and it is impossible for them to harbor any impure thing whatsoever. Wherefore, the principle of monogamy is a perpetually fresh ethic, and when the self-consciousness of the individual is extinguished, it breaks down forthwith. Those who in part seek for beauty and in part flounder in selfish desires are perpetually the enemies

of monogamy. The fact that among advocates of free love may be found some who practice strict monogamy is the result of these individuals experiencing a self-awakening and knowing that polygamy and polyandry are psychically impossible. Therefore, the principle of monogamy has not been derived from mere theory, but from the perfecting of individual character. If character be destroyed, the principle collapses.

Love and Personality

In the ancient times of incomplete personalities, monogamy was impossible; but since the coming of Christ completed personality has been presented to our view and we have become incapable of bigamous love. Yet, naturally, as I have just stated, the principle of monogamy breaks down if there is more or less of abnormality in the character.

Quite recently, in many parts of Japan, lovers, finding this whole-souled love unattainable, have sacrificed themselves; and there are certain thinkers who dispute the eternal validity of the principle of monogamy, regarding these cases as disproof of it.

However, I think quite otherwise, for in situations where lovers attain control over their environment, mastery of their passions, and consciousness of true human nature, their character union will, in any period whatever, be recognized necessarily as valid, and therein a perfect monogamy is realized. I therefore do not say, add one and one, and arrive at unity, but rather, that that which is essentially one cannot be divided into two. The two souls aflame will be perennially ardent. This is what I term monogamy.

Monogamy Is Eternally True

In ancient Greece, in order to secure children of fine physique, women of superior stock, even though married,

were as a matter of course considered to be free to do as they pleased. From the standpoint of race improvement, such a practice was highly commendable, that is, in an age so remote, when personality was undeveloped. In the present day of closer approach to perfection of personality, the practice absolutely cannot be tolerated.

Responsibility toward the race and perfection of personality are interdependent, and those whose natures have burned together in a synthesis of souls are the truly monogamous. Therefore, for persons who have experienced the self-awakening of conscience, there is no other way to choose than that of monogamy. It is not confined to Christian morality, but throughout the ages it is perforce an enduring principle.

Love and Marriage

How Sexual Desire May Be Properly Directed

In sexual love there are three phases: sexual desire, love, and marriage.

Sexual desire appears instinctively; and while it may be controlled it cannot be obliterated. It is a most sacred instinct, for by it the races of mankind are maintained and humanity perpetuated. But sexual desire does not necessarily carry with it selection. Sexual desire to which selection is added is love. Without romantic love sexual desire cannot be purified. In the strength of sexual desire inheres the potency of passionate love. The more intensely this love is practiced, the more possible becomes the ascent of man. Marriage is the means by which the social adjustment of passionate love is effected. It is the name given to the institution through which physical love, ever tending to be selfish and willful, is recognized, controlled, and accorded economic security and position by society.

Darwin, in his *Descent of Man,* says that marriage is the

method properly adopted by man for the perpetuation of the race; and he cites illustrations of the lengthening of life by marriage. Darwin appears, moreover, to have opposed the theory of celibacy. In my view, it is most closely in accord with Nature, in order to maintain the quality of the race, for man at the proper time to refine the sex-impulse. This impulse is not a moral lapse or anything of the kind. Tolstoy proclaimed an extreme individualism, overlooking the existence in man of a racial will, and absolutely denying that social instinct works through the medium of sexual desire. For my part, I believe he seriously erred. In the sexual act there is assured a certain kind of pleasure, and through this pleasurable experience is effected the preservation of the race, a result of the greatest importance. For if the sexual act were unpleasant, the perpetuation of the race might be quite impossible. Nature has given a flavor to sexual desire, and in it has created a garden of pleasure. But man's psychology is such that he is disposed to be one-sided: he forgets the preservation of the race and falls into the awful error of seeking his own enjoyment exclusively. It is for this reason that to-day sexual desire is separated from love and from marriage, and there have appeared the exploiters of commercialized lust.

Man's Degeneracy and Adulterous Marriages

When desire is separated from love and from marriage, it becomes that divisive love which is real lust, that which draws men's lives down to the horrible bottom of hell. For example, a man who upon marrying makes lust his sole aim, no matter who his mate may be, descends along the way of least resistance, so long as he can satisfy his own lust. He cares not a whit what the character of his mate may be or how society regards his conduct. He lives solely to indulge his own selfish desire, and is a mere slave to mean, mechanical

instincts. Marriage to such a man is a sort of private prostitution: when he tires of his wife or the prostitute with whom he is familiar, his lust demands new means of satisfaction. He is reduced to seeking for more stimulating, defiling practices. Such abnormal men are to be found in the licensed quarters, in *geisha* districts, in homes of the upper classes, and in all the slums—the saddest phenomena in the life of present-day society. We see, then, that Tolstoy had in mind this type of man when he said that a man could commit adultery with his own wife. The man who lives only for selfish gratification of his own lust demeans marriage to adultery. I know the sacredness of marriage and I am convinced that such adulterous marriages proceed from the degenerated instincts of man.

The Realm of Love Refinement

Thus the mission of love becomes one of deep import. In passionate love there is that which accompanies the sexual act; but once passionate love has developed, sexual conduct is no longer primarily sexual: it transcends sexual desire. Therefore, it is imperative that romantic love be emphasized—a spiritual, sacred love in which there is absolutely no admixture of the sexual. The love of St. Francis of Assisi and St. Clara is an example. Without any sexual relation they were intoxicated with a sweet love which was higher than that of husband and wife. Dante, though married, wrote never a line about his wife, but made Beatrice, the friend of his youth, the object of his affection and raised her to a position above that of an angel. The possibility of such sacred love as that of the medieval type arises from the fact that love is superior to sexual desire. It is the purest device for refining mankind. It calls to man to abandon the unlovely and cling to the pure. Thus it is that such relationships as those just cited are rendered possible.

Such must be the nature of the new order which will be set up by men awakened to completely conscious individuality, who advance to the task with the creative spirit. Into this order nothing impure can enter. Foul impulses cannot create the universe of love. In the realm of this sublime new order the quest of mere pleasure cannot be countenanced; and since there is to be creation, there must also be the bearing of suffering. In men who are rising to participate in this new world creation every vestige of mere impulse must vanish.

In animal society love is an impressive phenomenon. When the males of the lower orders have once accomplished their duty, the majority of them die without appearing to realize that they still have seed left. Indeed, among certain species the males are even killed and devoured by the females. The tarantula is an example, and numbers of other insects show the same tendency. In other words, the male which has once undertaken his part in the preservation of the species loses the qualification for repeating the act. In the animal world, then, passionate love is treated in this serious manner. Among men, however, it receives no such solemn, rigorous treatment. For men, in defiance of Providence, make selfish satisfaction the standard, and abandon the creative attitude.

The Discovery of "You" [5]*—the Other Person—and Marriage as Creation*

When one acquires this creative attitude toward love, one cannot lightly surrender oneself to another. The defect

[5] The philosophy of Nietzsche teaches only of the "I"—me, myself. My philosophy is the discovery of the "you" basis, the creation of the "you" inside of the "I." That is my philosophy of love. Herein is made plain the reason why so many personalities have appeared in the universe. God created men on the earth to live together in society. They are not to be self-centered, but to live in love, to serve one another.

in many marriages has been that they were not marriages as creation but unions for sexual intercourse. And they all proceed calmly on, though standing on the very brink of destruction. Their passion, as they call it, is easily exhausted; they are merely captivated by fleeting sentiment; they have lost the creative feeling. The love of the majority arises from sentimentality and has no time for the training of the will. It quite lacks strong, selective will. Today it drops the one once welcomed as the ideal wife, and tomorrow takes the cowardly position of transferring its affection to another woman. And such conduct is not considered strange; for folk fail to comprehend the creative feeling of passionate love. I venture to declare that passionate love is bound to be ethical.

When I declare that love must be ethical, I do not imply that love must be sacrificed to morality, but that love in its essence is above the sexual act. Wherefore, when one considers the various psychic relations, has regard to social relations as well, and settles one's own personal attitude, then in the ardor that flames up above these and as a result of the great determination to create a new order, passionate love itself emerges. In other words, passionate love must be that which wells forth from one's personality as a starting point, from the creative feeling of the other personality—the discovery and creation of "you"—and from the high intention to develop a new order. Therefore, it is impossible for one easily to shift from one lover to another. If one has many loves, it must be concluded that one has a multiplicity of selves; and such a one we call insane.

The Warmth and Endurance of Passionate Love

I desire to consider both the warmth of passionate love and its enduring nature. The love of Japanese people, though warm, has no power of endurance. Hence, many young

people change from one affection to another. I term this the love of divided personalities. How can any such love bring pleasure? In polygamous, divided love how can there be any quiet joy? For love to endure, it is necessary that it be maintained by strength of will. It is not for this reason that I maintain that love must be given a moral quality. If we are masters of single personalities, then at any given period it follows that we can have but one single affection; and this affection must continue as long as the personality lasts. Herein is the uniqueness of love. It is what may be called pure-mindedness, and the power which maintains this pure-mindedness is simply one's strength of will.

Marriage is a social relation achieved by the unificative effort of matured personalities. In marriage love is first accorded its social recognition; upon it is bestowed the great guarantee of social approval. Society is blessed through marriage, and marriage is blessed through society. Since love is essentially social, society desires to recognize marriage. Of course, since society today is in a transition period, many social phenomena are exceedingly confused. In such a transition period there are numerous instances of people who, awakened ethically to a holy love, are forced to contravene certain restrictions. There are certain forms of marriage which experience extraordinary difficulty in gaining social recognition. But that is only because this is a period of transition. In an ethical society every marriage ought to receive society's benediction. Love is higher than sexual desire. Essentially, love signifies the creation of personality.

The Unificative Effort Toward a Higher Perfection

The new creation of personality includes also the potential children of the union. We have heard the saying, "Children are the links which bind parents together," but only when we actually have children born to us do we realize poignantly

that the love of husband and wife is something above sexual desire. In my own experience, before our children were born I knew well that the love of husband and wife is sacred; yet after the birth of our children I realized this more keenly, and I came to consider that to the fact of the superiority of love over sexual desire must be further added the personalities of the children. I think that the stronger my love for my children becomes, the more I must love the mother of my children. It is no mere question of sexual desire. There is here a truly mysterious design; and as I view the unfolding of the new order, I am amazed at its grandeur. The love revealed through marriage is a triune existence, not a twofold one; it is truly the creation of a new order rooted in love.

There are men who frequently praise their wives extravagantly, love their children, and appear to be satisfied. Yet they become infatuated with some strange woman, and abruptly abandon wife and children. I am unable to understand the feelings of such men. They are utter bankrupts in personality; they have no unity of self. Their love is consequently bankrupt. In cases of the separation of couples who have children, I do not necessarily oppose the divorce; but I maintain that for one to abandon the wife or husband with whom one has been satisfied, whom one has loved, is a disgrace against oneself. How is it possible for one who disgraces oneself to have a sacred affection? Such a one lies to oneself. Of course, I do not mean to include here those who have been compelled to be parties to a match, or who have been coerced into marriage. Yet even in cases of marriage by coercion, where in the married life love has grown up between the two and a fusion of personalities has been achieved, if on the appearance of a third person one of them pretends that the marriage was not based upon a real romantic love and tears to pieces the love that has developed,

disregards the children and deserts the home, then I count that one also to have disgraced himself. In a case where the marriage did not at first depend on love, but love afterward developed, and finally grew cold, I cannot necessarily approve of such a passion. I will say rather that the love was deficient in moral discipline.

God Alone Can Perfect True Love

How marvelous it is that men and women who do not possess beauty of features do have various other points of excellence. If love depended upon mere beauty, there would be but a few in the world who could attain to sacred love. There are but few really handsome people in the world. If it be granted, however, that love is a new order which creates personalities, then beauty must be one of the elements. Yet there are many other elements which may be regarded as superior to beauty, whence arises the difficulty we experience in discovering perfect love unions. In many unions each recognizes defects in his or her own life. But where these defects are mutually forgiven and love for each other prevails, there may be discerned the functioning of God's powerful efforts. One perfect individual choosing another perfect one could not be called love; but in the effort of the imperfect to rise toward perfection inheres the creative spirit of love.

Marriages are contracted by truly imperfect characters; but where in spite of these imperfections, through love and respect, each is patient with the other and makes concessions, forming thus an unbreakable bond between them, there is, clearly, an indefinable atmosphere of creation. I would that every marriage might have God's recuperative power to work upon it. We must petition God to sustain our wedded lives, these unions of imperfect personalities. There can be no

attainment of sacred love, nor can the perfecting of home life be hoped for, without religious faith. In the times when love is quick to cool, we feel keenly the need of religious discipline. God alone can bring love to its fulfilment. Relying, then, upon true religious faith, we must develop our love to full perfection.

CHRISTIAN ETHICS *

BERTRAND RUSSELL

Bertrand Arthur William Russell, F.R.S. 1908; M.A., late lecturer and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, England, was born in 1872, the second son of Viscount Amberley. In 1894, he married Alys W. Pearsall Smith, of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. During the World War, in 1918, he was imprisoned for Pacifist activities. In 1920-1921 he visited Russia and China. His second marriage, in 1921, was to Dora W. Black, daughter of Sir Frederick Black, K.C.B. To them were born a son, John Conrad, November 16, 1921, and a daughter, Katherine Jane, December 29, 1923.

Mr. Russell is distinguished in the field of mathematics, political economy, and sociology. Some of his best known publications are as follows: *German Social Democracy,* 1896; *Essay of the Foundations of Geometry,* 1897; *Philosophy of Leibniz,* 1900; *Principles of Mathematics,* 1903; *Philosophical Essays,* 1910; *Problems of Philosophy,* 1911; *Principia Mathematics,* 3 vols., 1910 (with Dr. A. N. Whitehead); *Our Knowledge of the External World as a Field for Scientific Methods of Philosophy,* 1914; *Principles of Social Reconstruction,* 1917; *Mysticism and Logic,* 1918; *Roads to Freedom,* 1918; *Introduction to Mathematical Philosophy,* 1919; *The Practice and Theory of Bolshivism,* 1920; *The Analysis of Mind,* 1921; *The Problems of China,* 1922; *The A. B. C. of Atoms,* 1923; *The Prospects of Industrial Civilization,* 1923 (with Dora Russell); *Icarus, or the Future of Science,* 1924; *What I Believe,* 1925; *The A. B. C. of Relativity,* 1925; *On Education,* 1926; *The Analysis of Matter,* 1927; *An Outline of Philosophy,* 1927; *Skeptical Essays,* 1928; *Marriage and Morals,* 1929.

"MARRIAGE," says Westermarck, "is rooted in family rather than family in marriage." This view would have been a truism in pre-Christian times, but since the advent of Christianity it has become an important proposition needing to be stated with emphasis. Christianity, and more partic-

* This chapter is taken from *Marriage and Morals,* copyright, 1929, by Horace Liveright, Inc., and Messrs. Allen and Unwin, London, and reprinted in this volume with the consent of the publishers and author.

ularly St. Paul, introduced an entirely novel view of marriage, that it existed not primarily for the procreation of children, but to prevent the sin of fornication.

The views of St. Paul on marriage are set forth, with a clarity that leaves nothing to be desired, in the First Epistle to the Corinthians. The Corinthian Christians, one gathers, had adopted the curious practice of having illicit relations with their stepmothers (I Cor. 5:1), and felt the situation needed to be dealt with emphatically. The views which he set forth are as follows:[1]

> 1. Now concerning the things whereof ye wrote unto me: It is good for a man not to touch a woman.
> 2. Nevertheless, to avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband.
> 3. Let the husband render unto the wife due benevolence: and likewise also the wife unto the husband.
> 4. The wife hath not power of her own body, but the husband: and likewise also the husband hath not the power of his own body, but the wife.
> 5. Defraud ye not one the other, except it be with consent for a time, that ye may give yourselves to fasting and prayer; and come together again, that Satan tempt you not for your incontinency.
> 6. But I speak this by permission, and not of commandment.
> 7. For I would that all men were even as I myself. But every man hath his proper gift of God, one after this manner, and another after that.
> 8. I say therefore to the unmarried and widows, It is good for them if they abide even as I.
> 9. But if they cannot contain, let them marry: for it is better to marry than to burn.

[1] I Cor. 7:1-9.

It will be seen that in this passage St. Paul makes no mention whatever of children; the biological purpose of marriage appears to him wholly unimportant. This is quite natural, since he imagined that the Second Coming was imminent and that the world would soon come to an end. At the Second Coming men were to be divided into sheep and goats, and the only thing of real importance was to find oneself among the sheep on that occasion. St. Paul holds that sexual intercourse, even in marriage, is something of a handicap in the attempt to win salvation (I Cor. 7:32-34). Nevertheless it is possible for married people to be saved, but fornication is deadly sin, and the unrepentant fornicator is sure to find himself among the goats. I remember once being advised by a doctor to abandon the practice of smoking, and he said that I should find it easier if, whenever the desire came upon me, I proceeded to suck an acid drop. It is in this spirit that St. Paul recommends marriage. He does not suggest that it is quite as pleasant as fornication, but he thinks it may enable the weaker brethren to withstand temptation; he does not suggest for a moment that there may be any positive good in marriage, or that affection between husband and wife may be a beautiful and desirable thing, nor does he take the slightest interest in the family; fornication holds the center of the stage in his thoughts, and the whole of his sexual ethics is arranged with reference to it. It is just as if one were to maintain that the sole reason for baking bread is to prevent people from stealing cake. St. Paul does not deign to tell us why he thinks fornication so wicked. One is inclined to suspect that, having thrown over the Mosaic law, and being therefore at liberty to eat pork, he wishes to show that his morality is nevertheless quite as severe as that of orthodox Jews. Perhaps the long ages during which pork had been prohibited had made it seem to the Jews as delicious as fornication, and therefore he would need

to be emphatic as regards the ascetic elements in his creed.

Condemnation of all fornication was a novelty in the Christian religion. The Old Testament, like most codes of early civilization, forbids adultery, but it means by adultery intercourse with a married woman. This is evident to any one who reads the Old Testament attentively. For example, when Abraham goes to Egypt with Sarah he tells the king that Sarah is his sister, and the king believing this, takes her into his harem; when it subsequently transpires that she is Abraham's wife, the king is shocked to find that he has unwittingly committed sin, and reproaches Abraham for not having told him the facts. This was the usual code of antiquity. A woman who had intercourse outside marriage was thought ill of, but a man was not condemned unless he had intercourse with the wife of another, in which case he was guilty of an offence against property. The Christian view that all intercourse outside marriage is immoral was, as we see in the above passages from St. Paul, based upon the view that all sexual intercourse, even within marriage, is regrettable. A view of this sort, which goes against biological facts, can only be regarded by sane people as a morbid aberration. The fact that it is embedded in Christian ethics has made Christianity throughout its whole history a force tending toward mental disorders and unwholesome views of life.

St. Paul's views were emphasized and exaggerated by the early Church; celibacy was considered holy and men retired into the desert to wrestle with Satan while he filled their imaginations with lustful visions.

The Church attacked the habit of the bath on the ground that everything which makes the body more attractive tends toward sin. Dirt was praised, and the odor of sanctity became more and more penetrating. "The purity of the

body and its garments," said St. Paula, "means the impurity of the soul." [2] Lice were called the pearls of God, and to be covered with them was an indispensable mark of a holy man.

St. Abraham, the hermit, however, who lived for fifty years after his conversion, rigidly refused from that date to wash either his face or his feet. He was, it is said, a person of singular beauty, and his biographer somewhat strangely remarks, that "his face reflected the purity of his soul." St. Ammon had never seen himself naked. A famous virgin, named Silvia, though she was sixty years old, and though bodily sickness was a consequence of her habits, resolutely refused, on religious principles, to wash any part of her body except her fingers. St. Euphraxia joined a convent of one hundred and thirty nuns, who never washed their feet, and who shuddered at the mention of a bath. An anchorite once imagined that he was mocked by an illusion of the devil, as he saw gliding before him through the desert a naked creature black with filth and years of exposure, and with white hair floating to the wind. It was a once beautiful woman, St. Mary of Egypt, who had thus, during forty-seven years, been expiating her sins. The occasional decadence of the monks into habits of decency was a subject of much reproach. "Our fathers," said the abbot Alexander, looking mournfully back to the past, "never washed their faces, but we frequent the public baths." It was related of one monastery in the desert, that the monks suffered greatly from want of water to drink; but at the prayer of the abbot Theodosius a copious stream was produced. But soon some monks, tempted by the abundant supply, diverged from their old austerity, and

[2] Havelock Ellis, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex,* Vol. IV, p. 31.

> persuaded the abbot to avail himself of the stream for the construction of the bath. The bath was made. Once, and once only, did the monks enjoy their ablutions, when the stream ceased to flow. Prayers, tears, and fastings were in vain. A whole year passed. At last the abbot destroyed the bath, which was the object of the Divine displeasure, and the waters flowed afresh.[3]

It is evident that, where such views concerning sex prevailed, sexual relations when they occurred would tend to be brutal and harsh, like drinking under Prohibition. The art of love was forgotten and marriage was brutalized.

> The services rendered by the ascetics in imprinting on the minds of men a profound and enduring conviction of the importance of chastity, though extremely great, were seriously counterbalanced by their noxious influence upon marriage. Two or three beautiful descriptions of this institution have been culled out of the immense mass of the patristic writings; but in general, it would be difficult to conceive anything more coarse or more repulsive than the manner in which they regarded it. The relation which nature has designed for the noble purpose of repairing the ravages of death, and which, as Linnæus has shown, extends even through the world flowers, was invariably treated as a consequence of the fall of Adam, and marriage was regarded almost exclusively in its lowest aspect. The tender love which it elicits, the holy and beautiful domestic qualities that follow in its train, were almost absolutely omitted from consideration. The object of the ascetic was to attract men to a life of virginity, and as a necessary consequence, marriage was treated as an inferior state.

[3] W. E. H. Lecky, *History of European Morals*, Vol. II, pp. 117-118.

It was regarded as being necessary, indeed, and therefore justifiable, for the propagation of the species, and to free men from greater evils; but still as a condition of degradation from which all who aspired to real sanctity could fly. To "cut down by the axe of Virginity the wood of Marriage," was, in the energetic language of St. Jerome, the end of the saint; and if he consented to praise marriage, it was merely because it produced virgins. Even when the bond had been formed, the ascetic passion retained its sting. We have already seen how it embittered other relations of domestic life. Into this, the holiest of all, it infused a tenfold bitterness. Whenever any strong religious fervour fell upon a husband or a wife, its first effect was to make a happy union impossible. The more religious partner immediately desired to live a life of solitary asceticism, or at least, if no ostensible separation took place, an unnatural life of separation in marriage. The immense place this order of ideas occupies in the hortatory writings of the fathers, and in the legends of the saints, must be familiar to all who have any knowledge of this department of literature. Thus—to give but a very few examples—St. Nilus, when he had already two children, was seized with a longing for the prevailing asceticism, and his wife was persuaded, after many tears, to consent to their separation. St. Ammon, on the night of his marriage, proceeded to greet his bride with an harangue upon the evils of the married state, and they agreed, in consequence, at once to separate. St. Melania laboured long and earnestly to induce her husband to allow her to desert his bed, before he would consent. St. Abraham ran away from his wife on the night of his marriage. St. Alexis, according to a somewhat later legend, took the same step, but many years after

> returned from Jerusalem to his father's house, in which his wife was still lamenting her desertion, begged and received a lodging as an act of charity, and lived there despised, unrecognized, and unknown till his death.[4]

The Catholic Church, however, has not remained so unbiological as St. Paul and the hermits of the Thebaid. From St. Paul one gathers that marriage is to be regarded solely as a more or less legitimate outlet for lust. One would not gather from his words that he would have any objection to birth control: on the contrary, one would be led to suppose that he would regard as dangerous the periods of continence involved in pregnancy and child-birth. The Church has taken a different view. Marriage in the orthodox Christian doctrine has two purposes: one, that recognized by St. Paul, the other, the procreation of children. The consequence has been to make sexual morality even more difficult than it was made by St. Paul. Not only is sexual intercourse only legitimate within marriage, but even between husband and wife it becomes a sin unless it is hoped that it will lead to pregnancy. The desire for legitimate offspring is, in fact, according to the Catholic Church, the only motive which can justify sexual intercourse. But this motive always justifies it, no matter what cruelty may accompany it. If the wife hates sexual intercourse, if she is likely to die of another pregnancy, if the child is likely to be diseased or insane, if there is not enough money to prevent the utmost extreme of misery, that does not prevent the man from being justified in insisting on his conjugal rights, provided only that he hopes to beget a child.

Catholic teaching on this subject has a twofold basis; it rests, on the one hand, upon the asceticism which we already find in St. Paul, on the other, upon the view that it is good

[4] W. E. H. Lecky, *History of European Morals,* Vol. II, pp. 339-341.

to bring into the world as many souls as possible, since every soul is capable of salvation. For some reason which I do not understand, the fact that souls are equally capable of damnation is not taken into account, and yet it seems quite as relevant. Catholics, for example, use their political influence to prevent Protestants from practicing birth control, and yet they must hold that the great majority of Protestant children whom their political action causes to exist will endure eternal torment in the next world. This makes their action seem somewhat unkind, but doubtless these are mysteries which the profane cannot hope to understand.

The recognition of children as one of the purposes of marriage is very partial in Catholic doctrine. It exhausts itself in drawing the inference that intercourse not intended to lead to children is sin. It has never gone so far as to permit the dissolution of marriage on the ground of sterility. However ardently a man may desire children, if it happens that his wife is barren, he has no remedy in Christian ethics. The fact is that the positive purpose of marriage, namely procreation, plays a very subordinate part, and its main purpose remains, as with St. Paul, the prevention of sin. Fornication still holds the center of the stage, and marriage is still regarded essentially as a somewhat less regrettable alternative.

The Catholic Church has tried to cover up this low view of marriage by the doctrine that marriage is a sacrament. The practical efficacy of this doctrine lies in the inference that marriage is indissoluble. No matter what either of the partners may do, if one of them becomes insane or syphilitic, or an habitual drunkard, or lives openly with another partner, the relation of the two remains sacred, and although in certain circumstances a separation *a mensa et toro* may be granted, the right to remarry can never be granted. This causes, of course, in many cases a great deal of misery, but since this misery is God's will it must be endured.

Along with this extremely rigid theory, Catholicism has always had a certain degree of toleration for what it held to be sin. The Church has recognized that ordinary human nature could not be expected to live up to its precepts, and has been prepared to give absolution for fornication provided the sinner acknowledged his fault and did penance. This practical toleration was a method of increasing the power of the clergy, since they alone could pronounce absolution, and but for absolution fornication would entail eternal damnation.

The outlook of Protestantism has been somewhat different, in theory, less severe, but in practice, in some ways more so. Luther was much impressed by the text "It is better to marry than to burn," and was also in love with a nun. He inferred that in spite of vows of celibacy, he and the nun had a right to marry, indeed one might almost say a duty to marry, since otherwise, given the strength of his passions, he would have been led into mortal sin. Protestantism accordingly abandoned the praise of celibacy, which had been characteristic of the Catholic Church, and wherever it was vigorous it also abandoned the doctrine that marriage is a sacrament, and tolerated divorce in certain circumstances. But Protestants were more shocked than Catholics by fornication, and altogether more rigid in their moral condemnations. The Catholic Church expected a certain amount of sin, and arranged methods for dealing with it; the Protestants, on the contrary, abandoned the Catholic practices of confession and absolution, and left the sinner in a much more hopeless position than he occupies in the Catholic Church. One sees this attitude in both its aspects in modern America, where divorce is exceedingly easy, but adultery is condemned with far more severity than in most Catholic countries.

It is clear that the whole system of Christian ethics, both in the Catholic and in the Protestant form, requires to be

re-examined, as far as possible without the preconceptions to which a Christian education predisposes most of us. Emphatic and reiterated assertion, especially during childhood, produces in most people a belief so firm as to have a hold even over the unconscious, and many of us who imagine that our attitude toward orthodoxy is quite emancipated are still, in fact, subconsciously controlled by its teachings. We must ask ourselves quite frankly what led the Church to condemn all fornication. Do we think that it had valid grounds for this condemnation? Or, if we do not, are there grounds, other than those adduced by the Church, which ought to lead us to the same conclusion? The attitude of the early Church was that there is something essentially impure in the sexual act, although this act must be excused when it is performed after fulfilling certain preliminary conditions. This attitude in itself must be regarded as purely superstitious; the reasons which led to its adoption were presumably those which were considered in the last chapter as liable to cause an anti-sexual attitude, that is to say, those who first inculcated such a view must have suffered from a diseased condition of body or mind, or both. The fact that an opinion has been widely held is no evidence whatever that it is not utterly absurd; indeed in view of the silliness of the majority of mankind, a widespread belief is more likely to be foolish than sensible. The Pelew Islanders believe that the perforation of the nose is necessary for winning eternal bliss.[5] Europeans think that this end is better attained by wetting the head while pronouncing certain words. The belief of the Pelew Islanders is a superstition; the belief of Europeans one of the truths of our holy religion.

Jeremy Bentham made a table of the springs of action, where every human desire was named in three parallel columns, according as men wish to praise it, to blame it, or to

[5] Westermarck, *op. cit.*, p. 170.

treat it neutrally. Thus we find in one column "gluttony," and opposite it, in the next column, "love of the pleasures of the social board." And again, we find in the column giving eulogistic names to impulses, "public spirit," and opposite to it, in the next column, we find "spite." I recommend anybody who wishes to think clearly on any ethical topic to imitate Bentham in this particular, and after accustoming himself to the fact that almost every word conveying blame has a synonym conveying praise, to acquire a habit of using words that convey neither praise nor blame. Both "adultery" and "fornication" are words conveying such immensely strong moral reprobation that so long as they are employed it is difficult to think clearly. There are, however, other words used by those lascivious writers who wish to corrupt our morals; such writers will speak of "gallantry," of "love unfettered by the cold bonds of law." Both sets of terms are designated to arouse prejudices; if we wish to think dispassionately, we must eschew the one set just as much as the other. Unfortunately this must inevitably ruin our literary style. Both words of praise and words of blame are colorful and interesting. The reader can be carried along by an invective or panegyric, and with a little skill his emotions can be aroused by the author in any desired direction. We, however, wish to appeal to reason, and we must therefore employ dull neutral phrases, such as "extra-marital sexual relations." Yet perhaps this is too austere a precept, for after all we are dealing with a matter in which human emotions are very strongly involved, and if we eliminate emotion too completely from our writing, we may fail to convey the nature of the subject matter with which we are dealing. In regard to all sexual matters there is a polarity according as they are described from the point of view of the participants or from that of jealous outsiders. What we do ourselves is "gallantry"; what others do is "fornication." We must,

therefore, remember the emotionally colored terms, and we may employ them on occasion, but we must do so sparingly, and, in the main, we must content ourselves with neutral and scientifically accurate phraseology.

The Christian ethics inevitably, through the emphasis laid upon sexual virtue, did a great deal to degrade the position of women. Since the moralists were men, woman appeared as the temptress; if they had been women, man would have had this rôle. Since woman was the temptress, it was desirable to curtail her opportunities for leading men into temptation; consequently respectable women were more and more hedged about with restrictions, while the women who were not respectable, being regarded as sinful, were treated with the utmost contumely. It is only in quite modern times that women have regained the degree of freedom which they enjoyed in the Roman Empire. The patriarchal system, as we saw, did much to enslave women, but a great deal of this was undone just before the rise of Christianity. After Constantine, women's freedom was again curtailed under the pretense of protecting them from sin. It is only with the decay of the notion of sin in modern times that women have begun to regain their freedom.

The writings of the Fathers are full of invectives against Woman.

> Woman was represented as the door of hell, as the mother of all human ills. She should be ashamed at the very thought that she is a woman. She should live in continual penance, on account of the curses she has brought upon the world. She should be ashamed of her dress, for it is memorial of her fall. She should be especially ashamed of her beauty, for it is the most potent instrument of the dæmon. Physical beauty was indeed perpetually the theme of ecclesiastical denuncia-

> tions, though one singular exception seems to have been made; for it has been observed that in the middle ages the personal beauty of bishops was continually noticed upon their tombs. Women were even forbidden by a provincial Council, in the sixth century, on account of their impurity, to receive the Eucharist into their naked hands. Their essentially subordinate position was continually maintained.[6]

The laws of property and inheritance were altered in the same sense against women, and it was only through the freethinkers of the French Revolution that daughters recovered their rights of inheritance.

[6] W. E. H. Lecky, *History of European Morals,* Vol. II, pp. 357-58.

WHAT GOD HATH NOT JOINED *

JOSEPH FORT NEWTON

A Texan, born in 1876, Dr. Newton was educated at Hardy Institute and the University of his native state, taking his training in divinity at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, with later studies under James and Royce at Harvard. After a pastorate in Illinois, he went to Cedar Rapids, Iowa, where he became widely known as preacher and writer, holding at the same time a lectureship in English Literaure in the University of Iowa. Among his earlier books was a biographical study of Lincoln and Herndon, based on letters by the law partners of Lincoln never before published.

In 1916 Dr. Newton was called to London, as successor to R. J. Campbell in the pulpit of the City Temple, "The Cathedral of the Free Churches." For four years, during the worst of the world war, and for more than a year afterward, he held that historic church, going to and fro over England, Scotland and Wales as an ambassador of goodwill and understanding between England and America, as a basis of world order and abiding peace. Upon his return to his native land, Dr. Newton became minister of the Church of the Divine Paternity, New York, giving much of his time to preaching in colleges and universities, and to literary work; publishing, among other volumes, his *Diary of Preaching in London,* and a companion *Diary of Preaching in New York,* both of which appeared as serials in the *Atlantic Monthly*. He is one of the editors of the *Christian Century,* and conducts a regular department in *McCall's Magazine* devoted to the "Best Sermon of the Month," and is a contributor to other monthly journals in this country and abroad. Recently he was chosen as American Correspondent of the *London Christian World.* In September, 1925, he resigned his New York church to enter the ministry of the Episcopal Church as Rector of the Memorial Church at St. Paul, Overbrook, Philadelphia, where he is continuing his literary activities and college and university work.

Dr. Newton is a well-known Mason, being one of the founders of the Research Society of America, and the first editor of its journal, *The Builder.* His little book entitled *The Builders* is the most widely read Masonic book of our times, having passed through fifty languages, including a Syrian edition published in Damascus. He is a Past Grand Chap-

---

* Published in the June, 1923, *Atlantic Monthly* and in the volume of sermons entitled *God and the Golden Rule,* The Century Co. Republished in this volume with their gracious consent.

lain of the Grand Lodge of Iowa, and a K.C.C.H. of the Scottish Rite, Southern Jurisdiction. He has recently been appointed Grand Prelate of the Grand Commandery of the Knights Templar of the United States.

His latest books are: *The Religion of Masonry; God and the Golden Rule* (Sermons); *Altar-Stairs, a Little Book of Prayer; The New Preaching; Things I Know in Religion.*

I

THE problem of divorce, at all times so perplexing, has become acute in recent years. Tendencies too many to discuss have made it so. The mood and temper of the age, its yeasty unrest, its enfeebled spiritual authority, its shifting moral sanctions, its increasing economic pressure, the larger sphere and new demands of woman, the revolt against the standards of the last generation, with much else added, make the question complex and baffling. Even before the Great War the facts were disquieting enough; and, since its close, the riot of divorce has become almost an orgy, aggravated, no doubt, by the erotic legacy which the war left us. In England, where the public mind is more exacting, conditions are said to be worse than with us, until many fear that we are infected with the virus which undermined the ancient societies.

None the less, it is very easy to see the problem out of all proportion, and to become unduly alarmed by it. The glass of modern fiction reflects the facts, but in an exaggerated form, by bringing them to a focus and leaving other facts out of the picture. In a recent popular novel, called *Brass,* of five marriages studied, only one is endurable. It recalled a similar but much stronger story written some years ago, *Double Harness,* by Anthony Hope, to read which tempted one to conclude that marriage is what war is declared to be. The story is told with a brilliantly sinister power and acumen of soul-vivisection, in which worldly wisdom is salted with acrid wit, albeit touched, toward the end, with pity; showing what a ghastly thing marriage may be in the hands of fools

and self-lovers, in whom a swinish sensuality is joined with an appalling shallowness of soul. Both books are patches of perdition; but no one in his senses thinks of taking either as a picture of married life. Happily, so far at least, in spite of all the ado made about it, divorce, in proportion to marriage, is the rare exception, which puts the rule of the goodness of marriage to the test, and proves it.

How to conserve both the values of the individual and the hard-won inheritance of the race makes the real problem, of which divorce is only one phase. That is, among right thinking people it is so. As for the pusillanimous set of moral parasites, who pollute what they touch and pervert what they enjoy, a way can be found to deal with them as they deserve. More deadly by far is the subtle and pervasive cynicism in regard to marriage in our day. Much of our later fiction deals with it, not only lightly, but flippantly, and at times sordidly, with seldom a gleam of moral insight or spiritual vision, as if marriage had become a bondage from which to secure release.

So, often, it is, because one or both of the parties to it are held in slavery, not by marriage, but by some dark inner bondage of soul. The non-moral society portrayed in *Glimpses of the Moon,* by Edith Wharton, is typical of wide areas of modern life, including the precious pair of deadbeats whose story it tells; but one touch makes us pause.

> The little girl wound her arms about Susy's neck and leaned against her caressingly.
>
> "Are you going to be, soon, then? I'll promise not to tell if you don't want me to."
>
> "Going to be divorced? Of course not! What in the world made you think so?"
>
> "Because you look so awfully happy," said Clarissa Vanderlyn simply.

Such precocious cynicism in the nursery fills one with dismay, in that it poisons the springs of life. Nor is it so rare as some imagine, in an age when the hardships of virtue are an argument for lenity to vice, and the difficulty of duty is a reason for shirking it. Living in an air of indulgence, we are soft, flabby, and morally short of wind. If a thing is disagreeable, we do not do it. Homes are wrecked, social life is undermined, and children are sent adrift, because, forsooth, "I was unhappy"; just as in business life statutes are broken and moral principles disregarded, because "a man must get ahead." Trace almost any of our ills to its source, and its roots will be found in our worship of success, our cult of comfort, our quest of a "good time," our selfish love of the easy way, which turns out in the end to be a path of flame!

II

No wonder jurists, educators, publicists, and churchmen alike are puzzled, not alone by the spirit and facts of the time, but by a disinclination to face the facts squarely and think the issues through. Even among teachers of the finest moral insight, there is the widest diversity of judgment. At one end is Dr. Felix Adler, who will not allow divorce for any cause whatever, not even for infidelity to the marriage vow; though he will agree to separation, if conditions are intolerable. At the other end is Mr. Louis Post, who holds that anyone who asks for a divorce ought to have it; because such a request shows that real marriage, if it ever existed, is dead and ought to be buried.[1] Between the two extremes,

[1] The reference to Mr. Post, taken out of the context of his wise and well-considered book, *Ethical Principles of Marriage and Divorce,* is hardly just. It implies that he is an extreme individualist, if not a libertarian, which is very far from true. For religious reasons, he himself holds to the beautiful doctrine of "eternal marriage"; but he discusses the whole question from many angles. Indeed, it is because of his fine spiritual insight that I venture to use him as an example, in preference to

we find a long gamut of opinion, all the way from the sacramentarian to the libertarian, making the solution as much a medley as the problem. Meanwhile, the Church, when it does not actually evade the issue, falls back upon an ancient formula of doubtful exegesis, or else spends its time debating whether the word "obey" should be retained in the marriage rite!

It is indeed strange. At a time when we hear so much about the Social Gospel, no one seems able or willing to show us how a spiritual religion can cleanse, enlighten, and consecrate the relations of the sexes, which are the foundations of the social order. There is sore need of clear thinking and plain speaking on a cluster of questions—sex, marriage, birth control, divorce—which we dare not much longer ignore. My former colleague at the City Temple, in her series of addresses, *Sex and Common Sense,* is almost the only one who has dared to deal with such issues. Miss Royden has spoken as the situation demands, frankly and without fear, reverently and with a wise charity. It is in accord with the fitness of things that the greatest woman preacher of our time should render this service, giving the woman point of view in respect of questions on which women have been too long silent. Every page of her book is aglow with human sympathy and spiritual vision, as she seeks the truth in the light of the facts of life and the mind of Jesus.

For, whatever theology we may hold, not one of us but is ill at ease in his mind if he feels that Jesus is on the other side of any question. Nor is his teaching at all obscure, if we remember that He was a light-bringer and not a mere lawgiver. Those who read his words about divorce as literal law ought, in all honesty, to interpret his other teachings in

---

Ellen Key, in her *Love and Marriage,* or Bernard Shaw, in the preface to his *Getting Married*—though Shaw has a common sense which usually protects him from his own extravagances.

the same manner; for example, his words about selling all our goods and giving to the poor, and his injunction to non-resistance. It is odd to find men so literal on one point and so liberal on others. The spectacle of cruelty or cowardice masquerading in the guise of orthodox exegesis is familiar enough. Plainly, if we really want to know the meaning of any precept of Jesus, we must read it in the context and atmosphere of his teaching as a whole; in the free, sane, exalted light of his mind. Nay, more; we must be ready for daring adventure if we mean to follow his truth and make trial of his way of life.

As on so many other subjects, Jesus left nothing really new to be said about marriage and divorce, if we keep in mind his revolutionary attitude toward woman. To a captious question from his critics, He made reply, lifting the whole subject out of the mire into a higher air, where marriage is a permanent union, and a lustful look is adultery. Neither ascetic nor eugenist, free equally from prudishness and laxity, Jesus saw the fact of sex for what it is. With Him, marriage, like the Sabbath Day, is made for man, not man for marriage. Sex is secondary. Woman, in his thought, is not primarily an instrument of sex, nor even a potential mother. She is not first of all a woman, but a human soul of incomputable value and sanctity, to degrade whom is desecration. Therefore, to "look upon" her merely as an object of desire is a degradation of personality and a treason against God. Thus, in a world of putrid impurity, Jesus set forth his ideal of the new social order that He sought to found, in which all the facts of life are holy, and all its fellowships happy. To such a life his disciples are called, and for the man who lives in his truth and follows in his way there is no problem of divorce at all, since the Spirit of Christ forgives even the ultimate infidelity—as He Himself did in the court of the Temple.

What all this means in marriage is made vivid by a story told me in the North of England, of a man whose wife, soon after her marriage, fell into vicious ways, and went from bad to worse. One evening he came home to find, as he had often found before, that she had gone on a new debauch. He knew only too well in what plight she would return, after two or three days of a nameless life. In an empty and cheerless house he sat down to look the fact in the face, the better to learn what he must do. The worst had happened too many times to leave him any hope, and he saw what lay before him. The words of the marriage rite, "for better, for worse," had now a terrible meaning; but he reaffirmed his vow on his knees. When a friend who knew the facts ventured to commiserate him, he answered, "Not a word!" His wife did not mend her ways, but died in his house some years later, a poor wreck sunken in shame, with his hands spread over her in pity and prayer! Such is the Christian way of dealing with a tragic marriage; and before we use the words of Jesus as stones to throw at others, it behooves us to look into our own hearts.

Judged by the real spirit and purpose of Jesus, the attitude of the Church today in respect to marriage is untenable. Few of the marriages "solemnized" in our churches are Christian in any sense, since many of those so married do not even profess Christian faith, much less try to live by it. At best, many are only nominal Christians, and as often as otherwise they have not been instructed as to what Christian marriage means. Yet they receive the blessing of the Church, and, by implication at least, are expected to live by its vows. It is nothing short of absurd. Indeed, it is open to debate whether it is right to impose an ideal, meant to apply only to followers of Christ, as a law upon those who do not take upon themselves the obligations of his faith. In fact, the only honest thing for the Church to do is, either to distin-

guish between Christian marriage and common marriage, or else to refuse to be a party to any marriage except between those who make avowal of Christian principles; and then to insist that such a union is indissoluble by default of either party. By so doing it will lose in popularity, but it will gain in self-respect; and by being in line with the teaching of Jesus, it may the better hope to do by conversion what it fails to do by coercion. For coercion it is, whether the ideal of Jesus be written into a law, or enforced by a social pressure.

III

Now, consider. In the world as it is,—which Keats called "a vale of soul-making,"—where the Kingdom of Heaven often seems like a visionary scene suspended in the sky, there are all kinds of folk, of all grades of mind, character, and condition; refined, vulgar, clever, stupid, and neutral. People marry for their own reasons, or for none that anyone can discover; and many of them are not fit for marriage at all, unworthy of its sanctity and incapable of its high demands. Mistakes are inevitable. Hasty, ill-considered, foolish marriages are made every day, foredoomed to failure. All kinds are braided together in marriage—the degenerate, the diseased, the abnormal, the criminal, the roué, those of unbalanced minds and tainted blood—many whose union can mean nothing but tragedy, and whose parenthood is a social disaster. In such a world, as he who has eyes must see, divorce, in one form or another, is a necessity, if not a commandment.

Those whom God has joined together are not lightly to be put asunder; but there are those whom God has not joined together. It needs no insight to see that there are cases where to continue the marriage relation is a deeper affront to morality and public order than any divorce could be. There are conditions of degeneracy, of infidelity, of malicious perver-

sion of all that is holy in the marriage vow, killing not only love but respect, and dissolving any real union by automatic process. There are malignities of disposition, outrages against personality, mordant hostilities, and cruelties of behavior far worse in their erosive and blighting destructiveness than any brutality of physical violence, or any deflection from the fidelities of wedlock. Such marriages are a lie, and if we really desire truth and purity, some way must be devised to heal these social cankers. One hesitates to describe the attitude of those who seem to prefer regularity to reality, and are willing to tolerate any horror so long as it is hidden under the smooth surface of society.

Nor is divorce by any means an unmixed evil. So far from being an attack on marriage, it is in fact an attempt to protect its sanctity and preserve its permanence. When allowance is made for every kind of abuse, from which nothing human is exempt, if there are moral reasons against divorce, so there are moral reasons in favor of it. This at least is true: the sanctity of marriage lies in a sacred union of hearts, which the Church may bless and the State make legal, but which neither can create or annul. Where love is, there marriage is; where love is not, marriage has ceased to be. For marriage to go on when love is dead puts before us a situation which, if described for what it is, would require the use of words that cut like whips of fire. If a loveless marriage is chaste just because it is legal, then chastity is a thing of rite and rote, an empty form and not a principle of purity at all. No wonder the late Lord Bryce once said that the morality of a country is not to be measured by the number of divorces, but as often as not the other way round. Its condition may be really worse if its people cynically allow their social life to rest upon anything less noble than the bond of moral love, which alone can make it holy and enduring.

Often enough divorce is silly, sad, nauseating, and in other

ways afflictive of the community. Often, too, it may be a greater mistake than marriage, and it carries penalties of its own known only to those who have had to face it. Either way it is a tragedy for the child, who is the most pitiful figure in the plot, whether he is bereft of one parent, or doomed to live in a home where love is only a memory. Instead of being the sybaritic luxury so many people think it is, its victims are in fact sacrifices, more or less involuntary, to the general good. It may have the value of a horrible example, to deter others from rushing into a marriage of fancy, or of worldly station. Its glaring publicity, its hideous revelations—ridiculous when not disgusting—are not things to be invited. At best, divorce is a clinic, a piece of social surgery attempting to salvage the wreck of marriages which are manifestly mistakes, if not tragedies. Anyway it will go on, until we find some better way whereby a marriage may be ended legally, when it has already been ended morally.

IV

To discuss what should be the law of the land in the matter of divorce is beyond my competence. Still, all must agree that in the social control of marriage, as of anything else, law must be an embodiment of the living will of the people, and not merely the stony grip of the dead hand of the past. The South Carolina law, which refuses to allow divorce on any ground, is clearly the expression of a tradition, rather than the voice of today; more the sentiment of a proud and conservative past, than a legal aid to the social morality of the present. The ideal of home life in the state is of a high order, but not more so than in other states of the South, where divorce is permitted. Nor does the law seem to apply with equal rigidity to the black folk, among whom marital irregularities are quite common. Even so, it is easily evaded by setting up a legal residence elsewhere, before returning

to the state to live. For all these reasons, the law is hardly a case in point; but it does serve to show how the developing moral judgment of a community may be thwarted, if not arrested.

For a better example of the workings of a rigid law—albeit not so stern, in that it allows divorce for infidelity—we must go to England, as revealed in the Rutherford case recently decided. The man was a brute from the first and all along, ending his career by a foul murder, for which he escaped execution on plea of insanity, which was no doubt justified. Years passed, and the wife sought divorce on grounds of adultery,—proved at the first trial, but later dismissed,—and her petition was accordingly denied. Had the man not been a lunatic, he would have been executed, and the wife would now be free. Because he is insane, she must remain, in law, his wife—tied to a dead body, with no hope of release. Here is a marriage of no value to society, much less to the parties to it, since no one argues that they should live together, even if it were possible. Why should not the woman have her liberty and the right to remarry if she so desires? If it be true that hard cases make bad law, it is equally true that bad law makes hard cases; and an injustice so atrocious ought to move even a staid people to mitigate the severity of a law which is neither just nor merciful.

About all that we need ask of the law is that it set up a safeguard, as much against a rigid cruelty as against the laxity which makes possible the consecutive polygamy so often flaunted in our faces by moral morons. So much is plain; but beyond that the law cannot go very far. My own feeling is that the less detailed the law is, the wiser it will be, provided we institute special courts for the purpose, in which both men and women shall sit as judges, where issues as difficult as they are delicate may be dealt with in a manner worthy of their solemnity. Such courts, it need hardly be

added, should have the sanctity and privacy of a confessional; and between the application for a divorce and the granting of it, there should be a pause of time for reconsideration, to guard against rashness and action taken in haste. In the most favorable environment, it is never easy for an outsider to pass on the conditions which make a marriage intolerable. Often a mere trifle may be the last straw on a burden of misery or indignity carried for years, making it unbearable. At any rate, as we dare not be satisfied with the present system, if we cannot devise a better plan, we deserve to live under a menace.

A rather wise pastoral experience, on both sides of the sea, has ripened some thoughts into convictions. For one thing, he will look in vain who hopes to find a simple solution of this sadly tangled problem: it does not exist. Each case of unhappy marriage stands by itself, and must be judged by its own facts, which refuse to fit into any glib formula. For that reason, a rigid and detailed law as to the grounds of divorce in all cases, without regard to the human equation in each case, works frightful cruelty and injustice. But much can be done without law. In England, during the last year of the war, and the awful year of moral collapse following it, when men were returning to their homes after years of absence, conditions were appalling. My study at the City Temple was a confessional, in which tales were told that made the heart sick, revealing the weakness of poor human nature, its dark dishonor, its selfish sin. Yet even then, as before and since, often in cases where divorce might have been legally obtained, it was possible, by tact, by moral suasion, by sheer love of young lives astray, to reawaken love, adjust disputes, and save homes from ruin.

After all, divorce is the dark end of the problem; the real remedy lies in making marriage a nobler and finer thing than it is. The whole conception of the relation of the sexes must

be lifted to a higher level, and interpreted by moral intelligence and spiritual vision, in the light of human realities and social values. For the moment, a revolt against the prudishness of a former time has swept too far toward a frankness that is not modest, and a liberty hard to know from license. None the less, out of the agitation of our time a clearer insight will emerge, and a finer fellowship in marriage; but not without bitter suffering, much of which might be averted in individual cases by very simple arts. For the most part, it is what workmen call "an inside job"; and until we have learned to live with ourselves and keep the peace, we may not hope to live with another without friction.

WHAT IS MARRIAGE? *

AGNES MAUDE ROYDEN

Born November 23, 1876. Youngest daughter of the late Sir Thomas Royden, Bart., of Frankby Hall, Cheshire. Educated Cheltenham Ladies College: Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford. Honour School of Modern History. Worked at the Victoria Women's Settlement, Liverpool, for three years, and then in the country parish of Luffenham: Lecturer in English Literature to the Oxford University Extension Delegacy; joined the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies, 1908; edited *The Common Cause* till 1914. Wrote and spoke chiefly on the economical, ethical and religious aspects of the women's movement.

Became assistant preacher at the City Temple, 1917-20. Founded, with Dr. Percy Dearmer, the Fellowship Services at the Kensington Town Hall, March, 1920; transferred the services, June, 1921, to the Guildhouse, Eccleston Square, S. W. 1.

Publications: *Women and the Sovereign State; The Great Adventure: the Way to Peace; The Making of Women; Blessed Joan of Arc; Prayer as a Force; Beauty in Religion; Christ Triumphant; Life's Little Pitfalls; The Friendship of God; Political Christianity; Sex and Commonsense; The Church and Woman; I Believe in God;* etc.

It is probable that there is no subject on which ecclesiastical and secular opinion is so keenly divided in this country as the subject of Divorce Law Reform. So far as public opinion is articulate, organized Christianity, as represented by its officers, is practically solid against any extension of facilities for divorce, except for a rather academic belief that there should be equality between the sexes, while the laity are as a whole, but by no means so solidly, in favor of it. There are always, of course, a few ecclesiastically minded who will out-Herod Herod on ecclesiastical topics. There

* Published in the September, 1923, *Atlantic Monthly,* and reprinted with the courteous consent of both author and publisher.

is also a considerable number of working-class women whose opposition to easier divorce bases itself primarily on economic grounds. But, on the whole, the great mass of the people are in favor of reform, and the demand for it, though still largely inarticulate and unorganized, is undoubtedly growing stronger.

It is an interesting point for a prophet, whether this is not the issue on which the disestablishment of the Church of England may be decided. There are few questions, indeed, on which the Established Church feels more strongly than on the Establishment; few therefore on which she will not compromise or yield if that is threatened. She has endured the domination of her affairs by a Parliament, membership of which need not and does not involve Anglicanism, or even Christianity. She has accepted the appointment of her bishops by Presbyterian or Baptist prime ministers; of her parish priests by patrons who may be of any religion or none. Even her supreme head, the reigning sovereign, is not a whole-time Anglican. All this the Church endures with equanimity. But if there is a point at which her tolerance and genuis for compromise seem likely to fail her, it is on the question of marriage and divorce. It is even believed that she will risk the Establishment rather than accept another law than her own.

It will be a curious irony if this really shall prove to be the rock on which the Establishment is doomed to strike; for it is the Establishment that is the cause of offense between her and the Free Churches; and this question of divorce is one on which she and they are absolutely at one. When Lord Buckmaster's bill for increasing facilities for divorce was introduced into the House of Lords, expressions of opinion on its merits were published in all the leading newspapers. So far as one could judge by these, representative Free Churchmen were as unyielding in their opposi-

tion to all reform as their Anglican and Roman Catholic brethren.

It is exceedingly doubtful whether clerical opinion here represents anything more than a small minority of the congregations behind the ministers. But it is certainly noteworthy that official and articulate churchmanship (whether Anglican or Free) is immovably opposed to divorce-law reform now, while organized Christianity in the past has been exceedingly uncertain on the question.

Lord Hugh Cecil, one of the most distinguished of Anglican layman, affirms that opposition to divorce is based on the express teaching of our Lord Himself, given to us in the Sermon on the Mount and further elucidated, in answer to a question from the Pharisees in Matthew 19:4-6. Here, says Lord Hugh Cecil, our Lord explains to us the nature of marriage, and makes it clear that divorce is not only inexpedient or wrong, but, in fact, literally impossible.

> Have ye not read, that He which made them at the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh? . . . What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.

"They twain shall be as one flesh." This is marriage. And therefore Christ's teaching is that according to the original plan of God, man and wife are in marriage joined together for life and cannot be put asunder. Any second union is therefore, the original parties being alive, adultery and not marriage. Remarriage after divorce is not merely wrong, but is not marriage at all. It is not an unworthy marriage or a loveless marriage—it is adultery. . . . This same point, that our Lord did not merely prohibit divorce but revealed what marriage is and how it is inconsistent with

divorce, at once disposed of all those not very clear-headed persons who seem to think that the Church ought to conform to the law of the land in respect to the dissolubility of marriage, whatever that law may be. It is clear that, if in the mind of God marriage cannot be dissolved, nothing that the State or, for that matter, the Church, can do will make any difference. An Act of Parliament could as effectively regulate the conditions of regeneration, or enact that murder is consistent with Christian Charity, as that the remarriage of people wrongly divorced is marriage and not adultery.

This very interesting and, if the premises be granted, very logical theory of marriage is worth considering in detail, as it is evidently one which is likely to be adopted by "high" Churchmen in the future. It has been developed at some length by so learned a champion as Canon T. A. Lacy, and, when laid before the National Assembly of the Church of England by Lord Hugh Cecil at a recent session, made a very great and (I think) favorable impression.

It is clear, however, that though this may be the accepted teaching of the Church in the future, it has certainly not been so in the past, nor is it quite consistent with the Church's attitude in the matter at present. In an appendix to the Report of the Divorce Commission of 1912, we are reminded of the length of time which elapsed before the Western Church accepted the view that marriage is indissoluble; of the devices by which the hardships inevitable to such a view were escaped; and of the fact that the Eastern Church has never adopted it at all, and the Church of England abandoned it in the middle of the sixteenth century.

Neither the Early Christian Emperors nor the Early Fathers were able to take up a definite attitude on the whole question of marriage and divorce. . . . In 449 A.D. divorce was limited to some eleven causes, but divorce by mutual

consent was not abolished. This legislation practically represents the law of Greece today as accepted by the Greek Church. In Russia the Orthodox Church has adopted a more limited range of causes, namely: adultery, impotence, loss of civil rights and deportation, desertion for five years. . . . Justinian, a century later, restricted divorce by mutual consent to cases of impotence or captivity, or where either party wished to enter a monastery; subsequently this liberty was practically abolished by Justinian; but in 566 A.D., his successor, Justin II, restored the free right of divorce by consent, and it was not until the beginning of the eleventh century, at the moment when in the West the doctrine of the indissolubility of marriage was at last receiving universal assent, that in the East divorce by mutual consent was abolished.

Even now "the entire Eastern Church has an extensive liberty of divorce with the right of remarriage," while at the Reformation the Church of England adopted the curious device of granting the right of remarriage after divorce for adultery by a special Act of Parliament in each case—a costly remedy which made divorce a luxury of the very rich, and which was replaced in 1857 by our present Divorce Act, which, without altering the causes for which divorce might be granted, made it attainable by a judicial instead of a pseudo-legislative process.

It will be seen, therefore, that neither in the Western nor the Eastern Church, nor in our own Church of England, has the view advanced by Dr. Lacey and Lord Hugh Cecil, that marriage is by its very nature (or "in the mind of God") indissoluble, been consistently held. It may indeed be argued that this was because of the hardness of our hearts and the slowness of our understanding, which has compelled the Church to advance only by slow degrees to a complete realization of our Lord's meaning and purpose.

Such a contention would be perfectly justifiable, and has indeed been advanced with regard to other matters—the teaching of the Church on slavery, for example; on the position of women, and so forth. But a further difficulty presents itself when we learn that even Lord Hugh Cecil admits the necessity of granting divorce for a single cause—adultery.

It is true that this exception to a general rule is of doubtful authenticity; nevertheless, "in face of the text of St. Matthew's Gospel as we have it, it cannot be said that there is culpable perversity in believing that our Lord permitted divorce and remarriage for the cause of fornification only." Yet, in view of the general rule, "remarriage after divorce must be at the best a rash and undesirable thing."

But this is to abandon the whole thesis! If marriage is of its nature indissoluble, to dissolve it cannot be rash or undesirable, but is simply impossible. To admit even a single exception is to wreck the whole theory, which is based on the nature of marriage itself. It is equivalent to an assertion that, in the nature of things, once a man's head is cut off, he cannot grow another; coupled with an assurance that, if he does, it will be a rash and undesirable act. The whole point is that a man's body is of such a nature that it cannot grow a second head, and marriage of such a nature it cannot be dissolved. If this ground is abandoned, what remains but a mere difference of opinion as to the cause of causes for which dissolution ceases to be rash and undesirable and becomes just and expedient?

An attempt is made, however, to escape the dilemma by entering into a discussion on the nature of marriage. It is indissoluble except—doubtfully—for adultery, because adultery in itself is a breaking of essential marriage.

This brings us to an issue which has been evaded too long by the opponents of divorce reform: one which should have

been the first, not the last, to be faced. What is marriage? We are told that our Lord taught that marriage is of its nature indissoluble; we have never yet been told what our Lord meant by marriage, or in what it truly consists. Yet here is a vital matter, and one on which it is very easy to disagree.

Those who hold, for example, that divorce may be allowed, however reluctantly, for adultery and for adultery only, because adultery destroys the very essence and character of marriage, appear to overemphasize the physical elements in marriage, to an extent which to others seems to degrade it to the level of animal mating rather than human marriage. There is a certain piquancy in quoting the late Lord Chancellor, Lord Birkenhead, in such a connection, against the Archbishop of Canterbury; yet there are many who will find his statement far more convincing than that of the great ecclesiastic, and much loftier in its estimate of true marriage.

Said Lord Birkenhead, speaking in the House of Lords in a debate on the Matrimonial Clauses Bill, on March 24, 1920:

> The ecclesiastical case has been adopted under the influence of an almost unconscious opportunism—the case, namely, that, although marriage is not otherwise dissoluble, it may nevertheless be dissoluble in cases where adultery has been committed. I, my Lords, can only express my amazement that men of experience, men of affairs, men whose experience and opinions we respect, should have concentrated upon adultery as the one circumstance which ought to afford relief from the marriage tie. Adultery is a breach of the carnal implications of marriage. Insistence upon the duties of continence and chastity is important. It is vitally im-

portant to society. But I have always taken the view that that aspect of marriage was exaggerated, and somewhat crudely exaggerated, in the Marriage Service. I am concerned today to make this point, by which I will stand or fall—that the spiritual and moral sides of marriage are incomparably more important than the physical side.

This question is fundamental, and I invite your Lordships to consider it with the greatest earnestness. It seems to me that there can be no doubt as to which is the higher and more important side of marriage. If we think of all that marriage represents to most of us,—the memories of the world's adventure faced together in youth so heedlessly, and yet so confidently; the tender comradeship, the sweet association of parenthood,—how much more these count than the bond which nature, in its ingenious teleology, has contrived to secure, and render agreeable, the perpetuation of the species.

I do not know whether one of your Lordships would be bold enough to say that the physical side of marriage is the highest. I greatly doubt it. I do not think that the Most Reverend Primate, the Archbishop of Canterbury, who, I believe, is to follow me in this debate, would for one moment, if dialectically he were a free agent, lend the weight of his authority to the position that the physical side of marriage is the highest. And yet, be this observed, that those who oppose this bill must say that, and for this reason, that, if they say that the physical side of marriage is not the highest, they are committed to this monstrous and mediæval paradox, that they assent to divorce for a breach of the less important obligations, and they deny divorce for a breach of the most important obligations of marriage.

> I conceive this to be an insult to the spiritual and sacramental conception of marriage; and it is just because I place other elements in the marriage state far, far higher than I place the physical relationship, that I make this fundamental in my argument. I specially desire that any answer to that argument may deal with this point, that a breach of that which is higher must be treated by the State as not less grave than a breach of that which is lower.

Such an argument is hard indeed to meet. It can be met, if at all, only by a very clear definition of what true marriage is "in the mind of God," or "in the nature of things"; and this definition has been far to seek. Those whom God has joined together man must by no means put asunder. But whom has He joined together and by what sign are we to know them? The physical union cannot in itself constitute marriage, or many would have been mates. It is true that I have heard it seriously argued that the first sexual connection is marriage, and that such a marriage can never be dissolved. When I pointed out that, if this were so, a woman might find herself married to a man who was not married to her, and vice versa, I was assured that this was undoubtedly the case and "made no difference to the facts"!

The idea of a world full of wives whose husbands were not their husbands, and husbands whose wives were other men's wives, filled me with confusion and alarm. But if we are to avoid this terrifying conclusion, how are we to do it? The granting of divorce for adultery only, suggests that the physical bond is the whole of marriage. If it is not (and it is impossible to suppose that the Archbishop of Canterbury or any other decent person thinks it is), what is it that constitutes marriage "in the mind of God"? There lies the real point.

Let us examine the grounds on which, under canon law, a marriage was held to be no marriage and was therefore declared null. It is startling to find that among them occurs the following:

> Where one or other or both of the parties does or does not freely consent to marry the other, not understanding the nature of the contract.

A startling doctrine, indeed, and liable, one would imagine, to nullify the greater number of marriages made, in view of the blank ignorance of "the nature of the contract" with which most women have in the past commonly entered into it. But, however interpreted, it at least forbids the belief that sexual connection, even when permitted and blessed by sacramental marriage in a church, in itself constitutes marriage "in the sight of God." When, therefore, we consider the great affirmation, "What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder," we are immediately confronted with the question—whom has God joined together? And this question the mere statement that "marriage is indissoluble" entirely begs.

I have known women married to men only to be at once infected with a disease of whose very existence they were ignorant; men and women married in a state of intoxication; married for any kind of reason—wealth, position, safety, and so forth—which could possibly desecrate the idea of marriage. Were all these "joined together" by God? From his wide judicial experience, Lord Buckmaster gives us some instances of women infected by disease or victims of unspeakable savagery, or chained to an adulterer who has deserted her and in all but name is not her husband. Are these marriages in the sight of God?

Let us examine the teaching of our Lord again. We find it in the Sermon on the Mount:

> It hath been said, whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement:
>
> But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornification, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery.

It is now very generally believed that the phrase "saving for the cause of fornification" was added by the evangelist, and formed no part of our Lord's original saying. Personally, I believe that is so. Christ was laying down a principle, and the exception turns it into a rule—a thing in itself most unlike Him.

But throughout this great discourse, the evangelist represents our Lord as laying down principles of conduct. The sermon here divides itself into paragraphs each of which begins: "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time . . . but I say unto you. . . ." We are not to kill, not to commit adultery, not to take oaths, not to revenge our injuries, not to hate our enemies; and later, not to give alms, pray, or fast in public.

To which of these principles do we yield a literal obedience? The Church again and again has sanctioned war and capital punishment. Every bishop on the bench, every incumbent of a living, every witness in a court of law, takes oaths.

No country executes a man for murder, because he admits that he hates his brother, nor literally regards a lustful glance as adultery. Neither does the Church excommunicate Christians who refuse either gifts or loans to those who ask. Yet it is urged that Christians who have almost universally disregarded the literal meaning of every other principle enunciated in the Sermon on the Mount must literally obey the injunction against divorce on pain of disloyalty to their Lord. I have even heard it argued that this one injunc-

tion, though, on the surface, singularly like the others, is in fact couched in terms more definite, more peremptory, and clearer than the rest. I have already quoted these definite and peremptory instructions. Look now at those concerning the taking of oaths:

> Ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths:
>
> But I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by Heaven; for it is God's throne.
>
> Nor by the earth; for it is His footstool; neither by Jerusalem; for it is the City of the great King.
>
> Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black.
>
> But let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay; for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil.

Is it possible to be more clear, more peremptory, more definite? Yet hardly any Christian scruples to take an oath, and, I confess, the spectacle of a Quaker punctiliously "making an affirmation" instead always afflicts me with a sense of unreality. Is it upon such meticulous observances that our Lord would insist? Surely he meant us to understand that we were called upon to be so utterly sincere that oaths would be no longer necessary. There can be no great or fundamental siginficance between "taking an oath" and "making a solemn affirmation."

So at least the overwhelming majority of Christians have believed. Can they, however, completely set aside the necessity for literal obedience to a whole catalogue of requirements and, with any appearance of logic or reason, apply a rigid literalism to one alone?

If they are justified in doing so, they must at least not immediately refuse to do anything of the sort! This sounds

like nonsense; but in fact just so nonsensical is the position of rigid supporters of a literal obedience to Christ's words about divorce. For He also says, "What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." Yet (making the huge assumption that all legally married people are joined together by God) there is not a church in the world which has not admitted the necessity of, sometimes, putting them asunder.

> No branch of the Catholic Church requires a Christian spouse to continue living with one whose temper or behavior has become unbearable. Divorce is, and always has been, recognized as a sad necessity at times. What it does require in the partners so separated is a single life.

So writes—and quite correctly writes—an opponent of divorce with freedom to remarry. And everywhere Christian people and Christian churches have acted as she describes. In Great Britain, "the number of separation orders granted during the thirteen years ending 1908, the latest date for which statistics are available, totaled no less than 89,960. This represents an average for each year of 6689."

No one denies that such separations are sometimes absolutely necessary. But they *are* separations. They constitute a complete "putting asunder" of married people. Those who were "joined together" are now definitely and legally "put asunder." What then becomes of our literal obedience to the principle laid down by our Lord? He says nothing about partners so separated leading a single life; He simply forbids the separation. Yet those who oppose the extension of facilities for divorce admit with glib readiness the necessity for "putting asunder," and then go on to formulate a totally different injunction. "What (the Church)

does require in the partners so separated is a single life." Well may we ask, "By what authority?"

The very people who claim that this one principle, alone among all those enunciated by Christ in the Sermon on the Mount, must be literally obeyed, by an apparently unconscious, but not less palpable, jugglery, substitute for this command "Let not man put asunder," their own rule, "Let them put asunder and not marry again," and demand a literal obedience to their own invention! The very writer who urges literal obedience complacently remarks that no Christian denies the necessity, on humanitarian grounds, of the putting asunder which his authority, *ex hypothsi,* forbids!

Consider then the real significance of Christ's words, "What, therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." Can anyone be found to believe that by the joining-together of God, the Lord of Thought really meant no more than a legal contract, or even a religious rite? Is that like Christ? Is not the most salient characteristic of all his teaching its almost terrible emphasis on reality? Must not the real marriage of which we speak mean something which would make a divorce or a legal separation a horror? Yes—or any other device for keeping apart those whom God has joined together.

Worldly considerations, or a social organization which defers or prevents the physical union of those whose spirits are one in love, surely stand condemned before so great a saying as this. Has the Church troubled itself greatly at the obstacles placed by custom, by society, or by the law, in the way of perfect and sacramental marriage of those to whom God has given a depth of spiritual unity, a oneness of love which should, must, truly join them together?

No! It is not possible to believe that such a teacher as Jesus of Nazareth regarded as marriage the unions described

by Lord Buckmaster. In such there never was, or there has now ceased to be, anything left of what—I do not say Christ but—any ordinarily decent-minded person would regard as the essentials of marriage. Neither love nor respect nor forbearance, nor even the absence of active and odious cruelty, is there.

So clear is this, that no Church can dare to urge the continual living together of these "married" people. All admit that there is no true marriage here; all admit the absolute necessity of divorce; yet some, having abandoned the belief that such a marriage is real marriage, still insist on the now empty legal form, and do so—oh, strange irony!—in the name of Christ.

Would He then have insisted on a legal form from which all reality had departed?

It is impossible to base our laws on legal interpretations of Christ's sayings. If we did so, not only must the legal separation of married people be forbidden, on the one hand, but, on the other, divorce must be granted for a lustful glance (since Christ declared that this was equivalent to adultery), and men must be hanged for hatred, since the same Authority made it equivalent to murder. What we Christians have to do is to create and uphold such an ideal of marriage as Christ would recognize as "made by God," to which the very idea of separation would be abhorrent.

It would involve absolute fidelity—to the ideal before marriage, to the person after marriage. It should, being a spiritual union, be permanent, and, being physical, be sacramental. It should be the outward and visible sign of the grace of a spiritual union. No one should dare to marry unless he truly believes that his love is for life, and is prepared to accept the responsibility for such a love. He should know that body, soul, and spirit all go to a perfect union, and should regard the physical as the sacrament of

the spiritual love. Sacramental in that it not only expresses but actually conveys and intensifies love; sacramental also in that it must ultimately cease to be, not because something is lost, but because it is transcended. He should realize that passion, glorious and essential as it is, must inevitably pass at last, and should not confound its passing with the passing of love, but realize that love is something greater and deeper still. No one therefore should be allowed to marry in ignorance, and on this the Church should strenuously insist.

Every boy and girl should grow up to the knowledge that sex is a great creative impulse, and, being creative, is most sacred. They should learn that it is not part of our lower natures but, on the contrary, is associated with the higher forms of life, and becomes conscious, powerful, and individual, not as life sinks, but as it rises in the scale of created things. They should realize its significance to the race, and the meaning to human progress of the prolonged helplessness of human infancy. In a word, they should understand all the responsibilities of sex-love, both to each other, the home, and the race. They should know all that can be rightly known without experience.

But when that is said, how much is left unknown? All that can be known without experience! No one believes more strongly than I in letting the light of knowledge into hitherto dark places; no one hopes more from it. But to the end of time—as long as we are human—how tragically it must be to make mistakes!

Nothing is more glamorous, nothing more deceptive, than physical passion. With all the wisest teaching in the world, with all the good will imaginable, men and women sometimes will be deceived, and they will shake the stars with mutual vows of love who have in fact nothing but passion in their hearts. Such should know that love may still come, and should strive and long for its coming. Again and again

they will succeed. In no case should failure ever be regarded lightly or accepted easily.

But why shut our eyes to the fact that a failure will sometimes happen? And if it does—if the time comes when we are forced to admit that, of all the elements that make up a true marriage, nothing is left—let us admit the facts. I maintain, in the face of more orthodox moralists, that to pretend that a marriage is real when it is not is the real immorality, because it is dishonest.

I urge therefore that divorce should be granted when marriage has in fact ceased. It should not be granted because any one or all of a schedule of offenses has been committed, but because the marriage is no longer real. I have no desire to extend the list of causes for divorce. I believe that to do this—though it would be better than no reform at all—would leave us still in the quagmire of legal fictions, perjury, and collusion, which makes proceedings for divorce a joke to the indecent and a horror to the decent-minded. With regard to this form of lawlessness, it is notorious and apparently impossible to check.

The *Journal of the Divorce Law Reform Union* for October, 1922, quotes the case of a man who had been driven by her intolerable conduct to leave his wife and who was thereupon ordered to pay for her maintenance. He refused, knowing her to be leading an immoral life, and was imprisoned in consequence.

This was Charman's position when his wife, through solicitors, informed him that she would not further prosecute him for maintenance if he would give her evidence on which to obtain a divorce—"for business reasons it suited her to marry again." The man, delighted at the prospect of getting his freedom, and having heard talk of hotel evidence, had a friend go to tea with him at a hotel, but no misconduct took place. The wife petitioned for divorce, and

shortly before the case came on, Charman found out that his wife had given birth to a child a few months previously, which could not be his, as he had not lived with her for three years; he also learned that even if he got his freedom, as the case was undefended, and she would in all probability win, he would still have to pay her a third of his income for life. So he put in a defense, denied adultery, and the young woman produced proof to the same effect. The wife's divorce suit was dismissed, and the papers sent to the Public Prosecutor, and Charman was arrested for conspiracy and sentenced to four months' imprisonment. . . .

The point of the case is that it is by no means exceptional. It is notorious that a large number of people have been doing this sort of thing for years, but, being in a position to employ the right kind of lawyers and counsel, have never been caught; while this workingman, ignorant of the law and its operation, the first to be prosecuted for conspiracy, is punished; while a prominent man, who did the same thing, and courageously published it to the world at large, with the object of showing how ridiculous the law is, was not touched.

The *Journal* points out that "so long as adultery is the one and only ground on which freedom from an intolerable burden can be obtained, people will either commit the act or manufacture evidence." But this is hardly, in my judgment, a just comment. In the case of a wife (in England) adultery is not the one and only ground for divorce: she must prove cruelty or desertion as well. The consequence is, however, the same. She has to manufacture evidence of one of these also.

My point is that the whole method of obtaining freedom from an intolerable burden is a mistaken one. A marriage should be declared legally dissolved when it has actually ceased to be a real marriage; it should not be regarded as real by a legal fiction when it is not real. Attempts to pretend

that that is real which is not real will always result in attempts to prove that offenses have taken place which have not taken place, because the system itself is based on a refusal to recognize the truth.

It will at once be retorted that no judge can be expected to decide when a marriage has ceased to be a real marriage. Certainly such an issue is not an easy one to decide; yet it is decided every day when a legal separation is granted.

A legal separation is an admission that a given marriage is a hopeless and complete failure. No judge would or could refuse to adjudicate on such an issue. Lord Buckmaster, writing on this point, says:

> In no case that I tried did there appear to me to be the faintest chance of reconciliation: the marriage tie had been broken beyond repair, and its sanctity utterly defiled; nor, again, though I watched with extreme vigilance, was there any single case where collusion could be suggested. With regard to cruelty, there was no case which a competent lawyer, skilled in the knowledge of witnesses, could not have tried.
>
> I was, of course, faced with the question as to what is cruelty, which, we are informed, is so difficult that you want the King's Proctor as an expert in cruelty to keep the law steady. I made my own rules. If a man who was sober kicked his wife in the stomach when she was pregnant, that seemed to me enough; if she were not pregnant and he was drunk, he might have to do it again, or else her complaint might be due to what the most persistent opponent of my bill called "nervous irritation." So, also, with kicking her downstairs, or making her sleep on the doormat in winter—all of which cases I had to consider. I had no case before me involving the question of lunacy, criminality, for these,

as the law stands, are irrelevant considerations in connection with divorce; but the evidence on that is near at hand. Within the last few months two women have been left eternally widowed, with their husbands fast immured in criminal lunatic asylums, and in this unnatural state they will remain while the shadow of the years lengthens and life's day grows dim. Surely the desire to help such people is not, as some appear to think, prompted by Satan, but is a humble effort to carry out the principle of the supplication which asks that, while our own wants are satisfied, we should not be unmindful of the wants of others.

Lord Birkenhead says:

> It is urged that cruelty shall constitute a ground for divorce. I assure your Lordships that we shall find no difficulty whatever in formulating a definition which will be sufficiently lucid for the guidance of the Courts . . . the conception of cruelty will be examined much more closely by the Law Courts when we are divorced from our present unreal system of law.

Already, lawyers, magistrates, and judges have to consider and put their own interpretation on the facts advanced in claiming a legal separation. There would be nothing new in their having to do so when called upon to make the still more serious decision as to complete divorce. Mr. Freke Palmer writes:

> In advising a woman whether she had a case or not, I should not consider so much the time since the wife was deserted, but I should more particularly consider whether the circumstances were such as would convince a magistrate that the man intended to desert his wife.

Not the fact merely, but the intention, is taken into consideration. I urge that, in claiming or granting divorce, the same judgment should be used, and the point at issue should be, not whether one or another specific offense had been committed, but whether in the judgment of the Court the marriage itself had ceased to be in any respect a real marriage.

I suggest that the case should not be decided by one judge only, but by three at least, and that both sexes should be represented on the bench.

If the decision goes against the divorce, the matter should remain in suspense for a period of years, the length of the period to be decided by the law of the land, in accordance with the best possible expert opinion. But I hold that if, at the end of such period as the law decides, the married partners remain immovably and reasonably convinced that their marriage is not valid or real the Court should not have power to refuse divorce. If, however, only one of the partners should desire it, the decision should then be with the Court.

Will such a system raise or lower our ideal of marriage? I maintain most strongly that it will raise it. However we may camouflage it, the present position is that marriage consists in a legal contract, followed by sexual intercourse; and it is maintained that this is marriage, even though not one single respectable element of true marriage remains. By what amazing sophistry is it claimed that this is to uphold a high ideal of marriage? It is, on the contrary, to degrade it. It is as immoral as it is dishonest.

I am well assured that marriage is not merely an affair for the individual. Both Church and State do well to concern themselves with it. But let them do so at the right end—that is to say, at the beginning.

To fail in marriage is a great and tragic failure—tragic for the married partners, even more tragic for their children.

Everyone should be taught to think of marriage as a high and sacred responsibility. Both Church and State—but especially the Church—should regard it as a grave indictment against themselves that any of their members should marry without knowing what they are about.

Ignorance and levity should be made impossible, so far as any teaching or moral authority can make them so. No one should be allowed to admit failure lightly or quickly. Every effort should be made to create a deep sense of responsibility, to induce those who have failed to try whether success be not yet possible.

But so long as either Church or State bases its laws upon a fiction, as long as their morality leans upon a dishonest but absolutely rigid pretense, so long will they shirk the harder but truer duty of inculcating so high an ideal of marriage, so deep a sense of mutual and racial responsibility, that both separation and divorce will at last become as rare as they are always tragic.

THE CRISIS IN MORALS *

GILBERT MURRAY

Gilbert Murray, M.A., Oxford; LL.D., Glasgow; D.Litt., Birmingham; D.Litt., Oxford; Litt.D., Cambridge; F.C.A., F.R.S.L.; Regius Professor of Greek, Oxford University since 1908 and Charles Elliot Norton Professor of Poetry, Harvard University, 1926, was born in Sidney, New South Wales, January 2, 1866, the son of the late Sir Terence Aubrey Murray, President of Legislature Council, New South Wales, and Mary, the daughter of the Earl of Carlyle. At the age of eleven he left Australia for England and entered Merchant Taylor's School, London. He graduated from Saint John's College, Oxford, and was elected fellow of New College, Oxford, 1888.

His publications include *History of Ancient Greek Literature,* 1897; *Liberalism and the Empire,* 1900; *The Rise of the Greek Epic,* 1907, 1911, 1924; *Five Stages of Greek Religion,* 1913, 1925; *Faith, War, and Policy,* 1918; *Euripides and His Age,* 1918; *Stoic Philosophy,* 1915; *Collective Essays and Addresses,* 1922; *The Classical Tradition in Poetry,* 1927; *The Ordeal of This Generation,* 1929.

I FEAR that I suffer from many disqualifications for expressing any judgment on the subject of morals. For one thing, I am sixty and, therefore, in the opinion of some critics disallowed from the outset. I am a paterfamilias and, therefore, accustomed to a hypocritical use of authority. Then again I am an unmitigated highbrow, and do not understand the feelings of ordinary healthy men.

On this last point I do rather feel with my supposed critics. I agree that the traditional thinking and theorizing about morals, as about most other things, has been done too much by the people who happen to like thinking and theorizing, people of mild passions and sheltered lives, who

* Published in the January, 1920, *Harpers,* and reprinted in this volume with their full permission and that of the author.

scarcely understand the lusts and angers of ordinary humanity or the tough squeezes of the struggle for life. Yet there is no help for it. Thinking must be done by the people who do not mind thinking, however badly we do it. And the lowbrow may comfort himself with the knowledge that, whatever we think or write, it is he who will always govern us.

I wish to write, then, on the crisis in morals. But is there any crisis at all, or is the whole suggestion a silly newspaper scare? I think there is, and I will give one or two reasons for the belief.

The Japanese Government has recently published an *Annual of Japanese Art* for the year 1927, a beautiful book. In it there are two main schools represented, one which follows the native tradition and one which has fallen under the influence of Europe. I wish I could show my readers the pictures in question, for without them I cannot convince anyone who differs from me. But, as a student of history and civilization, I feel confident that if the two styles of art given in that book had been found by excavation on some ancient site, every critic would have said, "At this point it is clear that the old and fine civilization of Japan was overrun and almost destroyed by a peculiarly low type of barbarian. It is just what we find in the fall of the Minoan Empire, or in the collapse of Roman Africa under the attacks of the negroes."

Again, I notice in advanced Liberal journals, both in England and America, not merely a desire for legal reform in certain sexual matters where reform is probably overdue, but a sort of disinterested enthusiasm for sexual misconduct in all its forms, from obscene language to unnatural vice. A word of condemnation for such things produces a storm of protest. This tone recurs pretty often in history, but is unusually marked at the present day.

Lastly, I can appeal to the authority of so able an observer as Mr. Lippmann in his *A Preface to Morals*. He is convinced that among the young of the richer classes in America, at least, there is an exceptional state of moral anarchy. The point is well put by a friend of mine, writing about Lippmann's book: "I have much sympathy with this young generation. It has seen so many myths exploded around it: not merely the Christian myth, but such things as self-denial, altruism, public spirit, that it believes in no myths at all. And you need to be very tough indeed to be able to do without *any* myths." The writer uses the word myth in a peculiar sense, meaning, I fancy, what St. Paul meant by Faith, a belief not exactly proved nor provable, but held because of some general bias of character.

This is well put. You will generally find the same thing put crudely by people who have not the habit of considering the meaning of the words they use. There are people who say they are "unmoral"—which would mean that they saw no moral difference between, say, murdering their mother for a dollar and earning the dollar by an hour's teaching; or that they believe in "no general principles whatever"—*e.g.* that two by two equals four or that fire burns; or they mean to take nothing for granted but to try everything by experiment—*e.g.* to see if arsenic really poisons them. These statements and a thousand others like them, which you can find published in abundance, are of course utterly clumsy and inaccurate. The truth is, they express desire rather than thought. But that is natural; one of the surest symptoms of anarchy is the substitution of desire for thought.

Now the first great point to remember is that the Rebellion of the Young against the Old is normal, both biologically and sociologically. Biologically, there is a period during which the mother feeds the child, a period when the parents support and protect it and, therefore, control its actions, and

a period in which it breaks loose from control and insists on standing upon its own feet. Birds, who take their parental duties very seriously, slave to feed and defend their young for a few months, and then at the suitable moment turn them out of the nest and peck them if they try to get in again. Birds know their business. Biologically, the rebellion is right. It is also right sociologically. Modern psychologists have pointed out that man's attitude toward the Moral Law, or toward the approved conventions of his society, is one of what they call "ambivalence." That is to say, he has at the same moment, or at two successive moments, contradictory emotions toward it. As a representative of the society which imposes the convention, he feels indignation at the breach of it; as one of the individuals on whom it is enforced, he feels a certain hostility toward it and a wish to elude it. And in general one emotion or the other preponderates in a man according as he has most to gain or to lose. In the sphere of property the young man likes to take his father's handkerchiefs, collars, studs, golf clubs, tennis racket, and anything else that may suit him; only a very spirited father retaliates by stealing his son's things, and then to no purpose, for he has to pay for them. In the sphere of sex the young unmarried woman likes to pursue her natural prey unhindered and uncriticized; the married woman has secured her prey; it may be very limited in value, but she is content to ask for no more if only other women will not try to rob her.

This general clash of interest and emotion between the young and the old, between the attack and the defense, those who want plunder and those who want security, is practically speaking eternal in human society; and it is a little ridiculous for either party to profess pride or horror at it in the twentieth century. It occurs in all literature, especially in all comedy, and it always had in it an element of unreality.

With the stupid, passionate, and greedy young doubtless the rebellion takes form in action. With the intellectual young, if I may judge from my contemporaries at Oxford in the 'eighties, I should say it was almost entirely an intellectual rebellion, but it served the purpose, when necessary, of shocking our elders, and thus giving us ourselves a feeling of superiority. In actual conduct I should say the whole of our set at college was free from vice and we thought it the worst possible form to indulge in obscene language. But in speculation we were ready for anything, from the absurdity of the marriage laws and the anti-social influence of a belief in God to the desirability of encouraging suicide—on which I myself wrote a persuasive essay. I have little doubt that the same game was played by the clever undergraduates of previous generations, and is continued briskly at the present day. And I should like to say emphatically that the undergraduates, both men and women, whom I now know as pupils or friends seem to me every bit as well-behaved as we were, and perhaps a little more public-spirited and intelligent.

These considerations suggest that a great deal of the supposed "crisis" is not a crisis at all, but a normal and regular difference of attitude between the old and the young of the same period. But I think that would be to go too far. I think Mr. Lippmann is right in saying that the present difference is greater than normal and in some ways peculiar in character. Let us consider some of the causes that have been at work to produce it.

II

On some I will touch very lightly. There is the Great War with its shattering effect on custom and character, and its severing of actions from their natural consequences. But of that I have written elsewhere.

There is the rapid and widespread emancipation of women, and their entry into all fields of economic and intellectual work. This revolution must necessarily affect sexual morals, as the independent woman, earning her living by her own exertions, cannot possibly keep up the same extreme sensibilities as the protected woman nor indulge in the same helplessness or narrowmindedness.

In America there seems to have been a certain breakdown of religious orthodoxy; in Europe this occurred at least a generation ago, and did not, as far as I can see, have a bad effect.

Lastly there have been what I may call two discoveries and one false theory. The two discoveries are, first the sudden and startling advances made in the science of psychology, and second the wide dissemination of knowledge about methods of birth control. Psychology has taught us that much of our traditional moral language is based on false premises—for example that phrases like "unselfishness," "honor," "purity" need a great deal of analysis before we can attach a definite sense to them; and has at the same time familiarized us with information about the springs of human conduct which, however helpful it may be if taken in the right spirit, often produces a paralyzing effect on the character and sometimes provides an excuse for depravity. Birth control, and the widespread familiarity with the idea of such control which we must now take as a fact, have profoundly altered one side of the problem of sexual conduct. The greatest non-moral deterrent to promiscuous intercourse throughout history has been the fear of pregnancy: that deterrent has now, to a great extent, been removed, and those people—whether few or many—who were deterred from promiscuity only by fear of social punishment, are now almost free from that fear. All these influences have had a dissolvent effect. All of them in the first impression on an

untrained and unphilosophic mind are destructive of morality; and we must always remember that most minds are utterly untrained and unphilosophic.

Lastly, there has been the false theory: a theory which has already done a vast amount of harm in education and is still running riot in the sphere of art. I mean the worship of self-expression. I will leave art aside for the present, but in education I believe this vicious dogma is approaching its unlamented burial. No doubt it had some psychological excuse for coming into existence as a protest against an excessive authoritarianism which tried to turn out all pupils according to one pattern. It was right to consider each pupil's character and personality and train it in appropriate ways. But to suggest that the pupil's whole duty is to express himself, and the teacher's whole duty to help him to do so, seems to me to be the direct contrary of true education. What I as a student have wanted to receive—and what as a teacher I have tried to give—has been always in different contexts the same thing: I wanted to get into contact with minds superior to my own, and thereby to become capable of seeing things which I could not now see, and appreciating and enjoying things that were now above me. We all start life with an extremely limited appreciation of the greatness and beauty by which we are surrounded, and also with a pretty confident opinion that a thing which does not happen to please us is not up to much. I cannot imagine an education which for me personally would have been more utterly damnable than to teach me to be contented with my existing beliefs and powers and just express them—to take the raw, untrained Australian boy called Gilbert Murray as the measure of the universe, and simply encourage him to go ahead. I trust however that this nightmare will pass.

I have suggested, then, that the Crisis in Morals is due largely, though of course not exclusively, to a certain num-

ber of causes. I will now say a word about the real conclusions which I think should be drawn from these causes.

Of the false theory I will not speak. The way to deal with a false theory is not to believe it. Of the War I will not speak either. We must recover from it and learn, now that we have leisure, its true lessons. As to the emancipation of women, I think that so great a revolution has naturally produced some confusion of thought and conduct. As this confusion clears away, I think we shall find our current rules of sexual conduct, which were framed to suit one set of conditions, partly rewritten to suit another. They will be written, as they usually are, by women. They will probably be more sensible; but I see no reason to suppose that they will be lower or more lax in their demands on human nature.

But what are we to say about the advances in psychology, especially the theories of Freud, so much and so incompetently disseminated? I think there is no doubt that the first effect of the spread of these theories has been bad. It is rather like the first effect on medical students of the dissecting room and the operating theater. Some are horrified, some are brutalized, many are nervously upset. The action is twofold: first there is the shock of disgust at being thrown into familiar contact with things which ordinary social instinct, from primitive times down to the present, treats with extreme reserve. Second, there is the abrupt discovery that much, and perhaps all of our emotional and spiritual nature has a physical and often a grossly physical basis.

What should our attitude be to this new danger? Well, apart from exaggerations and follies on which I need not dwell, I think there is nothing to be frightened of. Surely we all knew all the time that our higher nature has a physical basis, and a very large number of our noblest emotions actually have a sexual basis? The fact remains that they are

by now miles away from that basis, and there is no reason for dragging them back to it. If Shakespeare was descended from some sort of anthropoid ape, that does not mean that *Hamlet* is only a mass of monkeyish gibberings. The important fact is the fact of development: the rise, intellectual and spiritual, of the thing that was an ape into the thing that is Shakespeare. The new psychologists talk much of the Internal Censor and delight to show us the unpleasant objects which he has attempted to hide. But the most interesting thing that they have proved is the actual existence of this Censor and all that his existence implies. The suppressions and disguises of which they speak so much are only his failures: they form the fringe of a much greater and more effective activity, rejecting, conquering, sublimating, or compelling change. And the very fact that a Censor within us does wish to reject certain things—however ineffectively he may sometimes do it—is of great psychological importance. It proves that there is, deeply implanted from time immemorial in man's nature, this instinctive determination not to be content with oneself as one is, but somehow to be cleaner and higher; to suppress and reduce to nothingness the sort of things that drag one down, and to concentrate attention and effort on the higher parts of one's being. It does not invalidate this consideration to be told that in cases of mental disease the Censor's work has to be undone. That is only to be expected in cases of disease. The point is that man, who has risen from the ape, has apparently done so by the help and guidance of this inward spirit which rejects filth and denies it. It is not Victorian prudery, it is not Christian asceticism, it is not even the Hellenic tradition, which dislikes uncleanness, physical and moral; it is something that springs eternal in the nature of man.

On birth control I will say only a word or two. I have

no sympathy with that form of social timidity which would keep from those who need it most, under due medical advice, information which is easily accessible to all the upper and middle classes and a mere commonplace among those who practice vice. But our question here is not whether the general knowledge of contraceptive methods is desirable, but, granted that it exists as a fact, what effect it ought to have on our moral beliefs and actions. The suggestion often made, and emphasized for instance by Mr. Lippmann, is this: since intercourse can now take place without any serious danger of pregnancy ensuing, not only is it much easier to escape detection, but the action itself is of much less social importance. It is sometimes added, on the same line of thought, that if the danger of venereal disease were also eliminated the action would become entirely unobjectionable from the ethical standpoint—as harmless as lawn tennis or dancing.

Now is this so? I put to myself two questions. First, when I have, on occasion, felt instinctive disgust or disapproval at hearing of some lewd behavior, was that feeling in the least degree dependent on the probability that the actions in question would lead either to venereal disease or to the birth of illegitimate children? I think, not in the least. I think the dislike was predominantly a feeling of fastidiousness, an æsthetic repulsion.

Second, I ask myself whether the removal of these dangers would have had any effect on my conduct, or whether the fear of them was ever consciously a working motive leading me toward one course of action or another. Again my answer would be, as far as I can judge, not in the least.

If that is so—and of course it is a matter on which we are all liable to self-deception—I think it will probably turn out that the moral or æsthetic sense of mankind, or at any rate of the progressive part of mankind, utterly rebels against the

treatment of sexual intercourse as a mere matter of physical pleasure without spiritual meaning: a principle which does not necessarily lead to monogamy, but does at least destroy desultory lewdness.

And here we strike, I think, on a very important observation. Social conventions change: the particular actions calculated to suit them change with them, as *e.g.* if the rule of the road were changed in England we should drive on the right instead of the left. But the quality required for the right action does not change. It is just as important to drive carefully and considerately whatever the law of the road may be. The driver who says, "First they say 'left,' then they say 'right.' It is all a mess and I am free to be a road-hog" is indulging in a false argument. So monogamy and polygamy are social conventions; but whichever you live under you can behave well or ill, you can be chaste or unchaste. This is not "mere Christian dogma." It is a matter on which all the progressive races for the last three or four thousand years have felt strongly and observed very closely. For it is a great mistake to suppose that people did not observe character before they had invented the proper scientific terms to describe it. Many an old nurse is a far shrewder judge of the psychology of a child than many a professional psychologist, though she could never put her knowledge in scientific or even in clear and consistent language. The psychological terms of ordinary speech, though scientifically elusive and often inconsistent, are as a matter of fact based on deep instincts and on sensitive observation. Social conventions may change; I think, as regards the marriage laws they will change and ought to change. But I have little doubt that the value of chastity and the need for chastity will remain, like the need for self-control, for fair dealing, for courage, for honesty, and for a number of other simple matters which can be felt better than defined.

III

And what is to be our attitude toward the Crisis itself? Many people, of course, will fly to supernatural sanctions, and seek to reëstablish morality on the basis which has already collapsed beneath it. No doubt make-believe will do a great deal, but it is a treacherous foundation on which to build one's life; and I feel in this tendency a kind of infidelity to the very cause which we are trying to serve, using insincerity to persuade people to be sincere. But my chief objection is a practical one. I believe that the accepted morality, though always open to criticism, is in the main solidly based on the experience of the human race. There are hardly any social facts so well ascertained as the main moral principles of society; and I think it absurd to base these well-ascertained principles on dubious dogmas or revelations about matters which are beyond the limits of normal human knowledge. Let me make my point clear. I am not denying the dogma: it may be true that Lazarus rose from the dead or that a certain experience of Professor Eddington is really a contact with God; but neither of these propositions is anything like as sure and well attested as, let us say, the social desirableness of honesty or sobriety. But I need hardly labor the point further. Fallible man is always trying to provide himself with weapons which shall be infallible.

The weapons which we really possess are of course imperfect. That is one of the essential conditions of the conflict that we call human life. Still, in the first place, we can put a good deal of trust in the normal reaction of society to anti-social vagaries. The corrupt young person gets himself or herself disliked. Even if inside a particular set it is considered admirable to be, let us say, drunken, lewd, and dishonest, the members of that set will in course of time

find that people outside the set are numerous and powerful; that it is awkward to go on doing things which they despise; and that perhaps after all they are right.

How far, again, can we trust to experience itself, since I say that our moral principles are based upon experience? Of course, not completely. The experience of the race extends over thousands of generations with millions of human lives in each. It can swamp the exceptions in the general rule, and it can wait to the end of a process to see the result. The individual cannot. Still he can observe and he can imagine. Experience is a very subtle drug, and a small dose of it can often make us understand and digest whole masses of observation and of precept. We learn to live by a mixture of the three, as we learn to walk or talk or play baseball.

And in the process of learning or failing to learn, how can we help those who in any way look to us? Here I have little to add to that which most sensible citizens know already. There are some mistakes to avoid. We should avoid being frightened. We should avoid hypocrisy. We should avoid the pursuit of edification at the expense of truth. We should avoid identifying the moral law with our personal interests or preferences. We should avoid preaching and finding fault, or trying to satisfy our own idealism by insisting that our sons and daughters should be perfection. All these are truisms. I believe that to people of my generation and that which has succeeded it it is more important to lay stress on the need for discipline. My generation neglected it. We were eager to be sympathetic and enlightened. Perhaps we were timid. We liked to regard all naughtiness as a form of illness. We made the cruel mistake of keeping the child or young person protected against the natural consequences of his actions; we prevented his learning the indispensable lessons of personal experience. We made on him the monstrous demand that he should supply all the necessary dis-

cipline of life from within by his own unaided virtue. I think, as a generation, we have reaped our natural reward.

Punishment is a blessed thing. I pity the young who have grown up without it. I pity the old, the masters and mistresses of households, whom nobody dares to contradict, who are never, never put into the corner or whipped as they deserve. I pity the kings and emperors who have gone murderous-mad because no one stood up to them or made them behave themselves. But punishment is of no positive value; only negative. For any positive help toward living a nobler life, apart from the influence of friendship and of education, I can only fall back on that real and widespread possession of the human race of which we have already spoken: that instinct which shows itself in the existence of the Internal Censor. It is an instinct both moral and æsthetic, which rejects things both because they are bad and because they are ugly, and pursues things both because they are good and because they are beautiful. Philosophers insist on drawing a distinction between these two, but I confess that I never can feel it very real. As far as I can analyze my own feelings, I should say that the motive which keeps me from a bad action is a feeling that as I contemplate it I do not like the look of it or the smell of it. I feel it to be ugly or foul or not decent—not the sort of thing with which I want to be associated. And, similiarly, the thing that nerves me toward a good but difficult action is a feeling that it seems beautiful or fine, the sort of thing that I love as I look at it and would like to have for my own. Though not infallible, this moral or æsthetic instinct is a true fact. I believe it to be generally very strong in young people, at any rate in those who have real life in them, and, though often misdirected while they make their usual experiments, it has a way of correcting its own errors and ultimately finding its right course. It, and perhaps it alone,

answers the most troublesome of all questions which the cynic can put to the moralist: "Granted that it is useful to society that I should be honest, why should I mind about society if I can find my own profit in stealing?"

I refuse then to be frightened, though sometimes no doubt I feel concerned. We are passing through a time of strain and change, and managing the necessary readjustments on the whole with good success. I trust for the general maintenance and gradual raising of the moral standard in a society such as ours: first to the influence of the facts of life and the lessons taught by experience; next to the social instincts and the reaction of a well-organized society upon its members by example, education, and training, by liking and disliking, admiration and disapproval; and most of all to this inward Censor of whom the psychologists tell us, this inborn moral or æsthetic instinct, the ineradicable heritage of humanity, by which men have from the very beginnings of civilization rejected and denied what they feel to be vile within them, sought what they love, and imitated what they admire.

ROMANCE AND RELIGION

Report of the Presbyterian Commission to the General Assembly

RALPH MARSHALL DAVIS

The Reverend Ralph Marshall Davis, D.D., author of the following chapter and Chairman of the Presbyterian Commission on the study of Marriage, Divorce, and Re-marriage, was born April 13, 1886, at Omaha, Illinois. He was educated at Missouri Valley College, where he graduated in 1908, receiving his D.D. from the same institution in 1922. He graduated from San Francisco Theological Seminary in the year 1911, receiving his B.D. in 1916. He received his S.T.M. from Harvard in 1918. He did further work at Boston University, Andover Seminary, Cambridge Episcopal Seminary and Washington University.

His first pastorate was at Westminster Church, San Francisco. He has served successively the Fourth Presbyterian Church at Boston, First Presbyterian Church of St. Louis, the Hyde Park Presbyterian Church of Chicago, and has recently been called to the Church of the Covenant, Presbyterian, at Erie, Pennsylvania.

For two years he was special lecturer at McCormack Theological Seminary, Chicago. He is widely known as a university preacher and as a popular lecturer before luncheon clubs, women's clubs, young people conferences, high schools, parent-teachers associations, etc.

He married Miss Mary Ruth Purcell, November 29, 1906, and from that union there are two children, a daughter, Mrs. Norton Clapp of Tacoma, Washington, and Ralph Marshall Davis, Jr.

The chapter following on "Romance and Religion" formed the main body of the report of Dr. Davis to the General Assembly held at Cincinnati in May of 1930.

EVER since the war it has been common knowledge that Christian morality has been receiving direct challenge. The Christian ideals of the relationships of men and women have not only been criticized but have been discarded by vast numbers of our population. The home has come in for its

share of cynicism and marriage has been tinkered with by all sorts of self-appointed moralists.

Especially is it recalled with shame, that the one voiceless agency of reform during these chaotic years has been the Church. With a paralysis of her efforts, with no clearly defined mind of her own, with no policy of cohesion, the Church has won the ignoring of the mass of people. She has not been thought worthy to be called into conference. Without influence, without a clear message, without the strength of her own moral consciousness, she has witnessed the plundering of individual and social morality and "has passed by on the other side." The Church at some time in the near future must take up by discussion, by teaching, and by Christian living this vexed moral situation and deliver her clear and unequivocal position on it for the moral guidance of the nation.

Eros and Agape

We are dealing with the oldest commodity with which man has had to deal. Somewhere, sometime, somehow there came into the possession of man a mighty force. This energy was to urge him up from the child of the earth to become the child of God. This intimate emotion was to dominate his whole person. The Greeks had the name "Eros" for it —Love. The New Testament writers refused the word "Eros" because they felt it did not express the genius of Christian affection. "Eros" was of the earth—earthy. "Agape," as we all know, was the term for Christian affection, a redemptive, suffering, joyous love. From that first century "Eros" and "Agape" have been in continuous combat. "Eros" has been triumphant repeatedly, arrayed in the garments of unrelieved nature, pagan in thought, epicurean in habit, seductive, strongly allied. "Agape" has sought to clothe "Eros," to make her modest, to safeguard her

intimacies, to define her natural joys, to control her within the bounds of her own sacred performances. Once more the titanic struggle is on and Christian morality is in the field against Naturalism.

The importance of this struggle is seen in the importance of the sentiment of love itself. For, out of its deep reservoirs man is to draw his home, his state, his school, his church. Out of it he is to fetch his civilizations. By means of love he scales his highest heavens; by it he descends into his nethermost hells. Through its sanctified development he reaches the apex of his earthly happiness and through its sad perversion he scatters the earth with pain, disease, broken hearts, disillusioned lives and leaves behind him the slimy trail of his own polluted progress. Through love he comes to know the illimitable personalities of his fellows. Through it God makes known Himself to man and through it man discovers God. Love becomes the reason for his labors, the causes of his wars, the challenger of his wilderness, the creator of his ideals, the interpreter of his nature, the driving force of his motives, the spur to his genius and activities. In a practical manner love is man's will, man's intelligence, man's manner of life—man's life itself. In a word, love is the universal profession of mankind.

It follows, then, that affection has become the chief mode by which the total personality of man can be expressed. The inner urge that life emerge in influence is the demand of love. It is the ingenious vent through which man makes known to his fellows that he is present in the world and that he is of great importance. Faith may be the dynamic thrust that gives him satisfactory reasons why he believes his world not to be the imbecile plaything of an insane Deity; hope may fill his to-morrow with an optimism sufficient to guide him in his future and probable activities; but love becomes

for man the chief executive as well as the obedient servant in doing the business of the world as well as in furnishing the rewards for living when the strenuous work-a-day world is forgotten.

Sex

The demand for self-expression in man calls for his complete passing into the life of another. He must become creator. It is here he makes the discovery of discoveries—Sex. Here is the most wonderful, the most beautiful, the most determinative force in the world. It is the glory of the man that was and is and is to be. Man, woman and a little child form the reason for all the world's seeking. The stage is now set for civilization. Or to put it another way: love has driven itself to found a home. In this home are to be established and safeguarded those products which the expressing life creates. Here are to be those appreciations, sanctities, intimacies, compensations, industries, ideals which woman and child must have and which, when attached to manhood, constitutes that maturing unit the complete history of which is the history of the race.

This unit—the home—refuses the diffusions and complexities fractional sharing. Its strength and its health are won only in the unity and secrecy of its own being. The Christian church has ever maintained its position of an unalloyed affection growing within an uncompromised home. No disasters are comparable to those involved in the rupturing of homes or of those physical and mental requisites that make for homes. No blessings are more congenial to happiness than those issuing from homes and from those moral conditions that make so largely for happy homes. No loyalties are so ennobling, so exacting and so replenishing as those which involve home. And there are no infidelities

so devastating to personality as those in which home and domestic character are betrayed. To break a home or the conditions of a home is to disintegrate life itself.

Moralities and Prophylactics

Strange that our own brilliant, versatile, masterful generation should be raising questions with reference to monogamy! Prophets have arisen with doctrines, bizarre and primitive. Imported vulgarities have taken the place of our home-grown moralities. A war of terrestrial proportions left civilization baffled, insecure, cynical, stunned and ready for those more immediately available refugees from the reign of death. In days when morality sags, moralists arise. Some with credentials and more often those with none to offer have hawked their wares to provocative youth and restless age. The older moralities have not only been questioned but they have been openly jeered and made the butt of many a college humor. To be modest means to be a prude, to be a prude means to be puritanical—and who can endure things Victorian! Such is one syllogism of modernity! Adultery is the fashionable theme of the stage and talkies. Sex pathology studied by specialists is advertised by only too many of our fiction writers. The "news value" of a moral breakdown is well known and many recent biographers have no interest in their subjects unless they can exhibit quite an unsublimated libido. Smut and dirt compound themselves into "good stories." Jazz with its primeval jungle tom-tom inspires the fevered forties to contortions of the dance. "Nature rules." "Rousseau revives." "Love is desire." "Desire is but to be satisfied." "Eros reigns." "Prophylactics have taken the place of conscience." "If you can't be good, be hygienic." "Let your opportunity be your guide." While these philosophies are by no means dominant, they are widespread enough to call out the Church to some of her

first work: namely, the education of youth in the ethics of Christianity.

During these days when the generation needs understanding rather than scolding, the church should understand sympathetically the peculiar social situations in which young people find themselves. The attitudes which are to support sex and marriage and the continuing home should be honestly stated. The Christian religion once more is entitled to a respectful hearing. In reviewing the literature having to do with the general state of affairs and the causes that seems operative in producing the vast moral and spiritual losses which have accrued during the last few years, the following seems a fair statement of the situation:

A Society on Magic Wheels

First. Home requires a settlement of life. It needs a soil not of shifting sand but one permanent enough into which it may strike root. All of us feel the itineracy into which life has been thrown. There is no need to frown upon the speed with which we move. Life and sex and marriage must simply adjust themselves with character, human and divine. Speed is not necessarily a bad thing. The world has been moving at terrific speeds for millenia without harm to us earth-dwellers. But until we know how to do our readjustment we must admit that the home is temporarily worsted in the rather unequal struggle. In our cities houses are usually rented. Proprietary interest and pride are waning. In fact, it is poor business to own homes at the high cost of owning the same. Many of our inventions tend to take us away from such homes as we have. The prosperity of the people and the increase of leisure make it easier to get away from home and to stay away. Change from place to place to find employment keeps multitudes on the jump. More and more it it thought proper for husband and wife to separate over

longer periods during the year. The installment plan has put luxuries within the grasp of the democratic masses who readily cultivate the aristocratic manner. Extensions of credit have made speculation the side issue with millions and have added to the nervousness of our people. Children have, in many cases, been robbed of the opportunity of permanent traditions.

Speed and the Spirit

Against these tendencies, none of them bad within themseleves, the Christian church has to operate. The charge that Christianity cannot succeed except with a backward and slowly moving civilization is something that most of us are unwilling to admit. It simply requires that we be versatile in remodeling our program and our methods to meet the whiffs of a rapidly approaching, retreating day. We can introduce into life the monogamic ideals and insist that they operate as the maximum of security for love, family and children. The speed of the day has not bewildered the truth of Christ's principles. We cannot change the mechanistic era, do not care to do it, but we shall still preach the dominance of the Christian way of living. To stand helpless in the presence of any challenging day is unworthy of the Church. The Church always has been both on the defensive and on the offensive. If we read history aright, she has ever been fighting with her back to the wall; her case has usually appeared hopeless. And yet, wonder of wonders, she remains the oldest of earth's going concerns, engaged in the same struggle in behalf of bewildered, drunken, confused prodigal sons and daughters. If a whole generation should glibly slide into wholesale sin, the meaning of that phenomenon to the Church could only be: increased business. We can dispute the right and ability of the change of habitat to change our morals. We can insist upon the durability of

character and the timeless element in a great affection. We can still be assured that the moral and the Christian life may be accomplished through education by men and by the Spirit of God. We can separate ourselves from those futilitarians who, despairing at the triumph of iniquity, cut the throat of their fighting spirit. We can preach high and unimpeachable living, can still declare Christ. We can glorify not the American Girl but American Motherhood. We can still point out that temporary arrangements under the name of love accomplish nothing but the wreck of personality; can urge the permanent worth of Christian homes as against those ephemeral attachments which defraud men and women of every attempt at happiness. The antidote for speed is the spiritual.

Static

Second. Another cause for the annoyances—physical, spiritual, social—with which our hard-worked day is afflicted, may be seen in the ease with which life may stagnate in a rapidly moving day. Speed not only breaks many lives, it leaves many far behind. The strain of losing, of failing to measure up, the fears and hauntings of poverty, ill-health, and ill-success—these add to those dissatisfactions with each other and lead men and women to snap their allegiances. The ideals of success have been modified greatly in the minds of multitudes during these luxurious years. Physical distresses, economic difficulties, insufficient financial income, overrated sense of necessities may make life stale. While all of them may add to a certain irksomeness of living, they are not sufficient to produce the fracture of those great ties that are to hold lives together, causing men and women to overcome together, forgive together, remain together, lodge together. The miracle of one-mindedness is not in the magic of a marriage ceremony. It seems to take years for one life

to unfold in the presence of another. To expect that life will be continuously compatible is expecting a rarer degree of perfection than that with which we are well satisfied in other departments of life. The childish confession that two persons of character cannot get on together but must run to the divorce courts as a social settlement of an individual problem would merit laughter were the consequences of the whole not so lamentably pitiful. Until people understand that the break of marriage is a public advertisement of their own inadequacies and incompetencies, the case is not fully understood. Stagnation because of too much companionship is not generally so true as infidelity because of too little comradeship. Problems of home management, money matters, mismanagement, extravagance and kindred matters usually can be settled by unheated conferences. Pre-home courses conducted by the public schools, by the Church or other local agencies would go far to anticipate difficulties which may arise later on. Today when truth is as available as is so much half-truth it becomes the inescapable duty of Christian authorities to advise completely young people with reference to the involvements of sex and its wider implications with reference to Christian living in the Christian home. A complete rewriting of education especially for young women will probably have to be made. Colleges will be forced to give more attention to the science of home making. The cure of stagnation will be found in the growing life of the two persons interested and to plead dullness of life is not of itself to be regarded as sufficient to sever the bands of mutual happiness. The widespread use of contraceptives for the total prevention, rather than for the reduction of the number of children, certainly produces distinct losses of personality. Granting physical and mental competency, to frustrate the coming of children to the Christian home is to frustrate a certain normal development that the

Christian monogamic marriage assumes. Easy divorce proceedings and easy means of preventing conception have an intimate connection that will never be given the public. There may be a place for the contraceptive under medical advice, but it still remains that a baby in the home now and then is a splendid escape for those suffering from an uneventful married life.

Happy Though Tragic

Third. We find multitudes of persons misunderstanding the fact that marriage is an invitation to share in the tragic aspects of our common existence. While happiness is implied, a home where life proceeds normally prepares itself to understand the nomenclature of birth, life, death, loss, failure, frustration, illness, blood, vice, sin. Marriage discovers the depths of life and love is unafraid to peer into those horrible pits into which life may dismally sink. A home has to deal with all those intimate disasters of character, reputation, and honor. Purity receives its hushed discussions. Home becomes the last retreat to the bruised, the degraded, the sinful. To its very door the hungry beasts track our children. Comrades in true marriage have opportunity to appraise those glorifying strengths and those apologetic weaknesses with which life abounds. Great character is demanded of those who would assay marriage.

One may recall with shame times when even the ministry has not fully understood the vast import of the marriage tie. We clergymen are justly criticized that we have spent much of our time in other than the sane, helpful and scientific teaching of our young people on this subject. We have not been either willing or skilled in the treatment of poorly adjusted lives. We have all been guilty of permitting false ideals to be presented to our communities and have let them go unrebuked. Too many of us have performed marriages

in the name of Christ without properly looking into the moral fitness of the candidates. It is possible for the pastor first to furnish himself and then to form classes in which he may give young people of proper age the ideals and facts of marriage, talks on personal purity and sex life and present Christian morality at every step as it may appear in the discussion. The silence of the clergy on these important themes is one of the ominous signs in the horrible catastrophe that has overtaken us. For this reason, our seminaries should offer courses on the biological, economic, psychological, pathological, ethical, and spiritual factors entering into the adjustments of men and women to the new life of the wedded pair. If it should become generally known that the ministry is really competent to deal with these life situations, it will make unnecessary this crop of social advisers which is trying vainly to deal with this welter without the help of the motives which personal religion supplies. We shall regain not only the respect of the community but also our authority when we are found capable of dealing with all those values that make for nobility in living. We shall be assisting men where they are most helpless in dealing with the situation themselves: namely, in their love-life. We shall be able, in case after case, to show that marriage involves love, suffering, sacrifice, and may lead to those great tragic moods of the spirit which, while they shake the soul, make it.

Desire

Youth, then, should be told that marriage is not for the specific ends of desire. It is not the legalized arena where lust may play its bestial rôle. It is the serious entering into the redemptive sharing of life which involves the shedding of blood. The mind should be disabused of the theory that the basis of marriage is happiness. "We are not happy!" How many times have we pastors heard that. While mar-

riage has a stake in physical happiness, it normally looks forward to the procreation and training of offspring. This means responsibility of such high quality that only the hardy will hazard it. The cheapskate who thinks of marriage as the outlet for his weaknesses is doomed to a cheap disappointment. Marriage does not cure of bad habits. It gets us out of no honorable difficulties. It is rather full of obstacles, some of which are inherent in the new situation itself and some acquired with the development of marriage itself. No difficulties are to be shunned, none to be invited, but all of them are to be shared by the comradeship. The purpose of marriage is not reformation. It should not be undertaken as a means of redeeming an erring partner. It offers normal living under genuine terms where celibacy may have cultivated unnatural attitudes toward life. It is instinct with the tragic, filled with the tyrannies that a great and noble love demands, blessed with all the freedom that obedience liberates and remunerates with all those private and proprietary privileges which a pure affection unstintingly grants.

Human Though Married

Fourth. The biological factor enters into the consummation of this great vital act. Human beings are getting married. The dead are once more speaking through the living. Earth's primitive League of Nations is in full session. One realizes for the first time keenly that "of one blood" hath He created mankind. Mixtures of race, nation, tradition, languages, custom, faith are taking place in the most potent, most secretive and most precise laboratory of God's building. Christian and pagan, Romanist and Protestant, the Kelleys and the Cohens are all experimenting in the new race to be. Remember that human beings are doing this deliberately. They are not innocuous angels. When one gets married he tardily recalls that he has married the whole

human family: race, education, religion, prejudices, tribal customs, and all the uncanny accretion of important detail that only heredity could afford to bestow. On microscopic item hangs the story of these two lives and the new drift in human affairs for which they will be responsible. These conditions so intimate and so strong may produce unexpected tensions threatening chaos to these two young lives. Here again an important duty unwittingly thrusts itself upon the minister, provided he has reason to suspect that the situation is fraught with perilous difficulties. There is but one colossal melting pot and that is marriage itself. The individuals that make up the medley of its strange contents are the minister's cares. Only the case system applied intelligently can serve in situations where circumstances are leading two young people into moral and marital disaster. Of course, wise and patient persons entering marriage (but who are wise and patient?) usually realize and seek to remedy the personal variations which inheritance and environment have produced. But prudence and prayerful oversight on the part of the minister will anticipate many a possible sharp corner around which these young people may turn too hurriedly.

Religion Makes a Difference

Fifth. Religion makes a difference. The light-headed view that the one unnecessary consideration is religion, is false and unworthy of men and women. Investigation has made it quite plain that moral and religious ideals play the leading rôles in married happiness. Mutual happiness must be stayed on something stronger than evanescent sex-desire. This is quite agreed upon by all working in this field. Life for men and women is a fellowship of such high and delicate order that it requires the buttressing of all possible strengths. It is safe to say that the inner life receives more

severe testings in the comradeship of marriage than anywhere else. It is at this point that religious values are seen. Strangely enough and also expectedly the problem of the broken home is not found a pressing one within the Church itself. The work of the Episcopal Commission reveals that the proportion of those divorced who were active members of the church is quite negligible. Hundreds of ministers report that divorce among the church membership is quite unknown. The figures of our own church seem to show that eighty-three per cent of the Presbyterian Clergy have never known a divorce between persons who were in active association with the Church.

> It would seem clear that the Christian Churches are doing fairly well with those who may be considered their faithful members and who not only profess Christianity but try to keep themselves regularly under the spiritual influences of the Church. However, the Church cannot wash its hands of the problem. While the number of divorces among Church-going people is small, it is large enough to demand attention, especially where only one member attends. A study of the membership rolls of our church would probably show few divorced persons on the roll at all and most of these find their divorces on the grounds permitted by canon law.

Religion does make a difference of such weight that it may be truthfully said that the direction the Church seeks to give is not to the Church itself but to that greater mass of our American citizens partly or wholly outside the positive influence of the Church. Immorality and divorce are problems largely outside the Christian fellowship but they have to be treated by the method of internal medicine. While the record is one for general thanksgiving it should

not produce a feeling that the Church has won the battle. Such is far from the case since the field of the unchurched is not being materially reduced and the pagan influence of worldliness at large tend to seep into the Church. The Church's best defense is an offense.

Church and State

The Church faces a double function in marriage. Through her ministry, she acts for herself and for the State. As an officer of the Church the minister has the moral and religious values of men at heart; as an officer of the commonwealth he is a mere functionary without the privileges of these larger interests unless he deliberately creates them. The present status of the ministry is unsatisfactory. Perhaps two distinct ceremonies ought to be required: one a civil and the other a religious ceremony. The latter will be purely optional but it will represent the positive convictions of the couple seeking marriage. This will save the Church much embarrassment and prevent the inconsistency of the position felt very keenly at present by large groups of conscientious ministers.

The Christian religion holds that the basis of marriage is the mutual love of a man and woman. Faith in God would seemingly be the first and most immediate ground for the wise foundation of any home. Companionate arrangements that assume less than this are fraught with peril. To base marriage on the insecure foundation proposed by certain of our sophisticates, namely that of sex desire, and subsidized at that, condemns the whole enterprise to speculation. For, with the coming of children, larger and different responsibilities develop. Here again, parents should be the care of the Church in a particular way. Here the ideals of Christian living will be expressed if at all. Religion should be the studied practice of every home. Father and mother are not only the provider and dispenser

of homely, common blessings but in a rarer way are priest and priestess of the household. Religion was born in the home and its return and restoration to the fireside are much to be desired. Social worship of the whole family at divine services has no substitute. The church school will greatly aid. In securing homes against the great marauder, immorality, the best lock to hold the door is none other than the Church. It would seem from statistics that the religious person has by far the largest opportunity for maintaining the maximum of married happiness and runs only an inconsiderable risk of family rupture. We expected religion to make a difference but we did not expect its margin to be so extremely favorable as the tables conspicuously show.

The Hunger for Guidance

The interest reflected through the press, church and secular, seems to warrant the statement that there is nationwide hunger for some guidance in this all important question. Fears possess many households, sorrow is a well-known visitor to others, disillusionment is the clammy reward for many bruised lives. Many of our youth have become cynical and discouraged; many of our middle-aged people have not the moral stamina to withstand the revival of modern eroticism; and sadness fills the hearts of multitudes of the older people who are at a loss to understand what has come over the American people. Money and morals are looking at each other with steady eye. The home and the haetera are cleverly jockeying for position. A darkness of irreligion has turned thoughtful people to some agency of light. It is sincerely hoped that the Church will once more become vocal in her teaching and leadership; may become the honored champion of mankind at its best and win for herself the honor of becoming the valid "Kingdom of God."

THE PROPER CHOICE OF PARTNERS *

COUNT HERMANN KEYSERLING

Count Hermann Keyserling was born July 20, 1880. Until the age of fifteen he was educated at home at the family estates Koenns and Raykull in Esthonia by tutors, and then went to a Russian school in Pernau, thence to Dorpat. Later he went to Heidelberg. In 1902 he took the German equivalent of his B.A. in Vienna, and it is about this period that he began his studies for his future vocation as a philosopher. In 1903 he left Vienna to live in Paris. Using Paris as his headquarters he frequently visited England, and his stay in France was largely devoted to reading and studying and also to a certain amount of journalistic activity. In 1905 he lost his fortune temporarily in the Russian revolution and lived for two years in the belief that he was penniless. He inherited his father's estates in 1908 and thereupon took up his residence there, that is to say, in Raykull in Esthonia. Here he spent a good deal of his time in the capacity of farmer looking after his estates, but he devoted much time to correspondence.

Count Keyserling started out on his journey round the world in the year 1911, and the period from 1912 to 1918 has been devoted to the writing of it. The book as a matter of fact was written in 1914, the war delaying its publication. In 1918 a second crisis occurred in his worldly affairs, for as a result of the Russian revolution he was deprived of his estates and his fortune. He had to begin anew, to live entirely by his work as a refugee on German soil. In 1919 he married a granddaughter of Bismarck.

Following the extraordinary success of the *Travel Diary of a Philosopher* he opened the School of Wisdom in Darmstadt at the invitation of the Grand Duke Ernst Ludwig von Hessen. The meaning and aim of the school is nothing else than a regeneration of mankind on the new basis created by the war.

The Book of Marriage, published in 1926, from which the following chapter is taken, is an attempt on the part of the Count to answer sympathetically and spiritually the human problems arising from the marriage relationship. In this volume he goes so far as to say, "Since it answer all fundamental questions relating to matrimony, it also contains the key to the solution of every individual problem arising in married life."

---

* From *The Book of Marriage,* edited by Count Hermann Keyserling, copyright, 1926, by Harcourt, Brace & Company, Inc., and reprinted with their kind permission.

THAT there are couples, however rare, which seem to be purposely created for one another, is an established fact. The reason for this cannot, however, be determined by intellectual processes. Is it, in accordance with Plato's teaching in the *Symposium,* a dualism arising out of what was originally a single entity? Does some God's eternal decree place in the world simultaneously two new souls intended for one another? Is the doctrine of reincarnation true? Or is what seems to signify a wise providence merely blind chance? No one can answer this question. Each believes what he must. The mystery is a problem beyond our intellectual powers. Consequently, the question of esoteric affinities, in its deepest sense, must remain outside the scope of this book.

But even a miracle can take place on our earth only within the compass of its laws. Just as Christ was able to express his sublime wisdom about God in parables that dealt with everyday occurrences, it can be shown that just the most profound and ultimate recognition has everywhere its corresponding part in the sphere of common sense. This means, as far as marriage is concerned, though the particular character of a given situation is not deducible in each case, that there are certain general laws of universal validity, within which this particular aspect manifests itself.

Two persons of different sex attract one another. Does it follow that they should marry? It is clear from the introductory chapter that this is not necessarily the case. Human beings are complex. And the marriage bond is only one of many; it is the most difficult to realize satisfactorily, and common experience goes to prove—unfortunately—that infatuation is the worst security for a prosperous marriage. This is not entirely due to physical attraction failing to satisfy man's soul completely, but principally because people usually fall in love—a careful distinction should be made

between infatuation and real love—with a type different from that which would prove suitable for marriage. Everyone is aware that the natural disposition of any person who is at all differentiated, if his heart is not fully possessed by one person, is to become attracted by the same type in every new incarnation. Psychoanalysis teaches us that in the case of man there are usually two principal types: the mother type (the basis of this being either his own mother, or an imaginary adaptation, as he would desire her to be) and the "comrade," the natural prototype for the latter being a sister. His two types correspond to the general maternal and comradely qualities that enter into every woman's nature, and the latter aspects often finds its embodiment in the courtesan. Generally speaking, only the mother type is suitable for marriage. For it has its roots in the primordial nature of man; it typifies responsibility and is therefore serious in character. In the comrade type, man seeks adventure, stimulation, and sport. Exactly the same statements, *mutatis mutandis,* apply to the differentiated woman. By their very nature these two types are irreconcilable. Consequently it is a mistake even to try to bring them into agreement. Each must decide for himself in which way and to what extent he intends to realize the two complementary sides of his affective nature. One thing, however, seems positive: the comrade should never become the wife. It is a mistaken policy for a man or a woman to marry his comrade. And here we have the first definite answer to the question of the proper choice of partners. Marriage in the true sense of the word is only possible where the attraction lies (to use a musical term adopted from Wagner) outside the "comradely motive" (*Freundschaftsmotiv*). Friendship may prove to be the most intimate relation of all. It may even be that souls which seem created for each other are never intended to marry. The more personal a man is—here

the artist creates the type—the less significance do superpersonal bonds possess for him. . . . Be that as it may, our fathers proved their wisdom when they claimed that marriage should be independent of personal disposition. Not because this was not desirable in itself; on the contrary, they only wished to imply that infatuation was not to be the decisive factor, because, for the majority of men, infatuation would directly apply to the "comrade." With most women the maternal instinct is so strongly developed that they readily fall in love with the right man. At any rate, they much less frequently come to grief in their friendships, as their feelings are more delicately graded. But as man is the suitor even when he is the captive, the idea of preventing personal affection from deciding, as a general precaution, is fundamentally correct. This is, morever, confirmed by all modern experience. Only very rarely does marriage between friends prove successful. The attraction which in such cases leads to marriage—from the man's point of view, a woman's stimulating and inspiring quality; and purely personal sympathy on the woman's part—cannot be prevented from languishing. Consequently, most of these marriages are stormy in character and, as often as not, culminate in divorce. And as the marriage relation is essentially indissoluble, this inflicts serious injury and produces a debilitating effect, if the people in question are not at all superficial characters.

Generally speaking, whom should people marry? This question cannot be answered with scientific precision, because ultimately every vital phenomenon is unique in character, so much so that when generalization is applied to any special case, it receives an interpretation reflecting the special character of the case. Knowledge of general principles will no more enable one to choose the right partner than mere knowledge of harmony and counterpoint makes a man into a composer. Moreover, on account of the very complex nature of

the question, it is quite impossible to formulate any rules having general validity. From a theoretical standpoint the exception may still prove the rule, but in actual practice it is often just the exception that counts. For example, if it is generally true that an hysterical person is unfit for marriage, it does, however, occasionally happen that this disease is actually cured by it. Again, it is asserted with justice that marriage between near relatives is generally detrimental; but at times it leads to the very best results. This explains why at one time any preternatural qualities in a man were attributed to his incestuous origin. I can recommend a brochure entitled *Whom Should One Marry?* (*Wen soll man heiraten?* Frankfurt a. M.; H. Bechold); it contains in a convenient and handy form the most trustworthy information on this subject, the result of experience and research, mainly from a medical and scientific point of view. As I cannot go further into this particular question here, I refer the reader to the above-mentioned work, although he will not find much of practical value in it. In fact, generalities are only useful to the individual if they can be, as in the case of an algebraical formula or a paragraph of the law, a frame enabling him to fit in his personal factors, and thus to find for them a definite value. That is why, if the solution is to prove satisfactory, the problem of how to choose one's partner properly calls for a different formula from that one employed by all the specialists; it must be considered purely from the standpoint of its signifiance. Only in this way can the problem be formulated without contradictions arising. As soon as it treats of particulars, it breaks up into two separate problems, which can only partly be taken together: first the choice of partners in respect of the partners themselves, and secondly, the same as regards posterity. It is evident that these two problems are distinct. As far as the child is concerned, the parents are only intermediaries, handing down to it the racial

inheritance; from the individuals as such it receives nothing. Further, any one who has children renounces by this every claim to his own personal independence. Moreover, if the child is the central problem, the question of personal happiness becomes secondary. For parental happiness is quite different from conjugal felicity; in the former case, different, impersonal impulses find their fulfillment. Lastly, the personal inharmony of the parents may evoke in the children that state of internal tension which is the necessary physiological agent for all productivity. That is why the majority of great men are the offspring of unhappy marriages, or at least of inharmonious ones. Even gifted youths often do not turn out well if their early surroundings have been too happy. Freedom from difficulties to meet and overcome does not tend to awaken personal aspirations. But there is, as has already been pointed out, one standpoint from which the problem of the proper choice of partners can be treated as a whole: that which sees in marriage an independent unit, composed of two parts. In this respect it greatly resembles a child, which is also the product of a dual association.

According to Christian teaching, married people are no longer separate, but of one flesh. Psychic unity is experienced personally by all true lovers. I need not here discuss the reasons for marriage being an independent whole, after what has already been said in the introductory chapter. If we keep this in mind, we may now state that since unity is the fundamental characteristic of marriage, as well as of the child, then congruency in the case of the parents has apparently the very same significance as the agreement of various capacities and impulses has in an individual; then, surely, the problem of choosing the right partner must be treated from the same point of view as the harmonizing of differences and contradictions in one's own soul. How can this be accomplished? Certainly not by a leveling process,

for all natural talents, as such, are immutable, just as the *genes* (the elements of heredity). On their own plane they can merely conflict with and exterminate one another. Harmony can only be obtained by establishing unity of a higher order, where the original problem is not solved, but dismissed. From the servitude of instinct, only a higher force can free us: love. We can only be saved from the natural revolt against the superior forces of destiny by consciously identifying ourselves with the higher powers that promote destiny, in cultivating wisdom and religion. Consequently, the individual soul is accounted to that extent superior, the more irreconcible elements it can unite together in a higher synthesis. From these summary considerations arises the first definite answer to the question under consideration. One should marry only that person who, on becoming his soul's partner, can assist him in becoming superior to those difficulties which he could not cope with alone, or which he realized were making him one-sided and incomplete. On the other hand, every one who is capable of understanding will find himself to some extent one-sided, because, as I have pointed out in the chapter entitled *Weltanschauung und Lebensgestaltung* in *Wiedergeburt,* each individual is merely an abstraction of the cosmos of humanity, which is a real entity. Its actual existence is clearly established by the fact that a faulty social instinct leads to disease. This is why most good marriages rest on a complementary basis. At the lowest stage, the sexual complement is sufficient in itself, for where the individual is undeveloped the racial instinct plays the principal part. At all stages, the inherent complementary requirements of one's own generic type are the determining factors. This matter, however, is gone into more fully by Jung and Kretschmer. In cases of extreme individuality, the strictly personal aspects of one's complementary cravings is decisive. It finds its release, according to C. G. Jung's dis-

covery, in the "soul-image" (*Seelenbild*) which is stored in every man's consciousness and functions as a complement to his conscious ego. This image does not merely confine itself to general attributes, but even delineates sex. If one person arouses a feeling of love in another, the former becomes, wherever motives of the mind and soul come into play, the visible embodiment of what has been inwardly desired and consequently preconceived, much as another's words often express our meaning where we were incapable of expressing it ourselves. This is the origin of those intimations of recollection which make people feel as if they had always known each other, and which all true lovers experience. One sees in the person he loves, as in a mirror, the reflection of his own "soul-image" (*Seelenbild*). Consequently it is little wonder that one recognizes at first sight a person who essentially belongs to one; in fact it is surprising that the *coup de foudre* is not the normal commencement of love. In this we have the explanation of absolutely all the precepts laid down for happy marriages, as well as of the contradictions involved in the well-attested rules. Thus, when it is held, on the one hand, that like associates with like, and on the other hand, that opposites attract one another, both statements are more or less true, according to the qualities required to complement one's nature. Natures whose development has been one-sided are generally attracted by their opposites, as only in this way can they overcome their limitations, whereas more balanced natures find their most suitable complements in those who are essentially like them, and show only a slight deviation from them in a few particulars. Details of special research in this matter will be found in the chapters that follow. But from what has already been stated, one thing is evident, which is at the same time the best answer to the question under consideration: that to ask oneself, "How can I, in a practical manner, recognize the person

who best suits me for marriage?" *is to put the question the wrong way.* There is no help for the blind; that is to say, for those lacking instinct. But whoever is conscious of his own soul will readily recognize the person who is best suited to him, just as a man with eyes sees the landscape in front of him; for the contact between souls is just as direct as that experienced in the material world. One can only advise each person to open his eyes, to put aside prejudices and self-illusions, to be loyal to his experience and to judge it aright; then he cannot go wrong.

As a result of the researches of Alfred Adler, it has become evident that each individual's life develops in accordance with a mental "guiding image" (*Leitbild*). This image anticipates the line of life and the possible course of destiny. It is a reality just like any other, but situated on a special plane. On this plane it is both self-evident and directly apprehensible to others, as in Nature all planes of existence react directly on one another; that is, spirit on spirit, soul on soul, "guiding principle" (*Leitbild*), just as one body reacts on another; in fact, much as directrixes describe the possible character of algebraic formulæ. Only when two people have these in accord is a sensible marriage possible. Marriage is primarily, as the introductory chapter showed, a matter of mutual destiny.

Only people of the same standing can be complementary to one another in the true sense. If they belong to different planes they do not properly complement one another, as the very essence of harmony is lacking; secondly, in accordance with the laws of gravity, the lower tends to pull down the higher. If we recall the analogy between the unity of the single soul and that of the marriage relation, we shall realize that it is impossible to harmonize a member of a lower and one of a higher plane on the principle of equal rights; either the one or the other will have the upper hand. *Consequently*

it is an essential condition for the proper choice of partners that both should be on the same plane of existence. On the other hand to be on the same plane really amounts to equality of birth, in the proper sense of the term. Consequently, the claim for equality of birth is not only absolutely justified but imperative. Since each part of a man receives its significance from the plane of his complete being, it is irrational to marry a person, even though in some particulars one is in complete unison with him, if, taken as a whole, he is beneath one. This can never prove satisfactory either for the parents or their children. Soul reacts on soul, and *gene* on *gene* (hereditary factor), so that if marriage takes place between people who are not of the same status by birth, it leads with but few exceptions to personal deterioration and proves a cultural retrogression for the human race. And if we now pause to consider the majority of modern marriages, we shall immediately comprehend why most of them are so wretchedly bad. The decisive factor, the question of the plane, is scarcely ever taken into consideration. In this manner no tradition of cultural ascent can ever take root. This is due to the reaction against antiquated conceptions regarding equality of birth. Equality of birth simply means being on the same plane, and nothing more.

Everything depends on the plane actually lived up to. Nor can this be secured by any letters patent. In order to acquire this for the future, many of the noblest-born of our day have even been driven instinctively to marry women below their official station. They require a more vital psychic constitution and the infusion of fresh blood. But the ancient idea is right: For the man of good stock, complete equality of birth should be the one requisite when contemplating marriage. Here, however, a slight correction is necessary. A given plane does not embody ultimate values. Each person should aim at the highest, just as the Indian does by

means of reincarnation, or the Englishman by concentrating on the common ideal of becoming gentlemanly. Thus the ultimate aim of marriage is not to maintain, but to elevate the plane. When this actually takes place, it is only thanks to the woman. If a man marries a woman below his station, he can rarely lift her up to his. But woman, as a born mother, is both able and specially fitted to raise the man; in this connection the dynamic and progressive principle lies with her. Whereas all highly bred male lines become extinct, a careful fate has ordained that the female ones most frequently survive. This forces well-born women to marry below their station and thus allows a frequent admixture of young blood; thus at length, by intermarriage, the general standard is raised. Thus the eternal feminine again and again exalts sinking humanity. Here again we realize how wise our forefathers were in permitting their daughters to marry below their station, but not their sons. The male is unable to raise his mate. When all has been said, Nietzsche struck the keynote with his words: "You are not merely to propagate, but to exalt the species." Therefore equality of birth in its true sense is an imperative condition for prosperous marriage. The person who marries below his standard, inasmuch as he is worth anything at all, should be judged more harshly than if he had spent his whole life on lustful passion. And each person should attempt, if possible, to marry above his station, in one sense or another. In fact, every man's natural desire carries him in that direction. That is why every man looks up to the eternal feminine without possibility of disappointment; that is why woman desires to reverence her lover. This idealization signifies an ardently desired reality. As new things can only be created by the intercourse of opposite poles, the higher culture of soul as well as of blood depends on marriage making this its direct aim.

To-day most people marry inadvertently. When the majority of marriages no longer prove happy or efficacious, it indicates an incorrect choice of partners. Here we have the solution of the problem of proper choice of partners, from the point of view of the partners themselves. All details and particulars can be obtained from special medical, psychological, sociological, and statistical works. The ultimate significance of all that the reader will find in these books has been anticipated by this essay. In fact, the special statements of science can be correctly interpreted only when taken in this light. *So we must finally conclude that marriage is only complete when it is the synthesis of biological, eugenic, sociological, ethical, and religious ideals.* On the other hand, this synthesis, which appears so difficult in theory, is quite easily attained in practice. An individual when analyzed is extremely complex, but he lives as a simple natural unit. The same applies both to the marriage relation and to the first step toward its realization—the proper choice of partners. *One need only be quite certain of what is actually right; the rest will then come of itself, as unconscious realization follows automatically on conscious perception.* One even should not ponder these matters too much.

One thing more. As man is essentially a dynamic, aspiring, evolutionary being, marriage can bring fulfillment only inasmuch as it intensifies life. Wherever it causes diminution it fails in its purpose. It is hardly necessary to state how fallacious are all counsels respecting the proper choice of partners which merely rest on indolence and convenience. Unfortunately this type of precept is often met with in books of a scientific nature and is frequently propounded by people who give advice on marriage questions. *Marriage is primarily a matter of responsibility; and consequently, if it rests on a false basis, it can but lead to misfortune.* It is not at all necessary that every Hans should get his Gretchen.

To break down because of an unhappy love affair, where its continuance was not desirable, is indeed a disgrace, for it is in everybody's power to break off an engagement before it affects his actual destiny. Lack of insight? That is an unworthy excuse, for it invariably indicates a want of good will. At any rate, this applies whenever the unconscious is fully aware of the facts. And this is so without exception when a man and woman attract one another.

THE PROBLEMS OF MARRIAGE *

GEORGE SHERWOOD EDDY

For years the name of George Sherwood Eddy has been identified with the life of the college people, not only of America, but of the world.

Following his graduation from Yale in 1891 he volunteered his services to the Y.M.C.A., and in 1896 went to India as the National Secretary. In 1911 he was appointed Secretary for Asia and became a member of the International Committee, working among the students of Japan, Korea, China, the near East and Russia, as well as India.

At the outbreak of the World War he joined the British Army as a Y.M.C.A. secretary, and at its conclusion he threw himself heartily into the work of social reconstruction. As a man of independent means he reduced his expenditures to a bare minimum, giving up an expensive establishment and curtailing all luxuries.

His observations of the breakup of the modern home, due not only to the industrialization of women, but also to the breaking down of commonly accepted moral standards, led him into the field of sex education for youth, out of which has grown and developed his valuable contribution, *Sex and Youth,* from which the following chapter is reprinted.

Some of his other publications are as follows: *The Awakening of India; The New Era in Asia; The Students of Asia; Suffering and the War; With Our Soldiers in France; Everybody's World; Facing the Crisis; The New World of Labor; New Challenges to Faith; Religion and Social Justice;* also books published in India and England.

MARRIAGE and the modern home are based upon certain primitive factors such as the need for sexual completion and conjugal affection. The first is an individual need of two persons each incomplete without the other, a biological urge springing from the glandular activity of the organism demanding life-fulfillment. The second is chiefly a product

* Published in Personal Problem Series: No. 9, *Sex and Youth* (Doubleday, Doran & Company, Inc., 1928), and reprinted with their kind permission and that of the author.

of social experience in the family, normally fostered by the care of the parents for their dependent offspring and for each other. The success or failure of the marriage will largely depend upon whether these two factors shall become genuinely shared interests in a growing friendship and partnership, or whether in both relations each partner shall seek to satisfy his or her desires at the expense of the other.

Space will permit only a brief consideration of a few essential conditions of successful marriage.

Conditions of Happiness in Marriage

1. *Mutual Adjustment in Physical Experience.*

We begin with the foundation rather than the superstructure. We begin where the genesis of life itself begins. We begin at the point where, if they fail, most marriages go wrong. Probably ignorance, selfishness and failure in physical functioning are the rocks and reefs on which most disastrous marriages founder. The failure is not usually due to any physical defect, for both parties are probably biologically sound. There is usually a psychological reason behind the failure in physical functioning, due it may be to ignorance, to prejudice, to early training, to maladjustment or to incompatibility. If the physical functioning is to be successful, it will involve knowledge, sympathy and understanding. Most failures in marriage could probably have been avoided.

We cannot in the matter of marriage just "trust to instinct." One might as well say: "James will not need a medical education; he always was a kind-hearted boy; let him trust to his instinct. John will not need to go to law school. He always was a just young man; let him trust to his instinct." Yet many young couples are allowed to drift into marriage as innocent as babes in the wood, only to wreck their lives through blundering ignorance and fumbling,

beginning often on the first night, when life-long impressions are sometimes made which may never be effaced. Married couples have perhaps suffered as much through ignorance as have neglected children and unguided youth.

A girl who could afford it would not think of entering marriage with no thought of her trousseau or the furnishing of her future home. A young couple would not contemplate a wedding journey abroad with no knowledge of the countries they were to visit, or provision for the foreign currencies to be used. Yet they are usually left to drift into marriage with no adequate knowledge or preparation for the most important part of their life, in their personal relations, physical and spiritual.

Not only does our present system fail to prepare and instruct young people before marriage; it often definitely inhibits and unfits them and actually prepares them for failure. Many girls, especially under the taboo of silence, enter marriage with dread. They are filled with sex fears. They have not only been taught modesty, but often a false modesty that may make marriage more difficult. Well-meaning parents, in order to keep their daughters virtuous, often create these fears so that when the realities of marriage come they bring a morbid shock. Upon that which is natural, beautiful and sacramental, many have unconsciously been taught to look with horror.

Let us cite a specific illustration. A well-known leader in this country was married. On his wedding night the young wife said in substance: "If I have to satisfy your lust I will do it, but I say in advance that I loathe and despise it, and you for wanting it." On the second night she came upon him with his head between his hands, weeping. When she asked what was the matter he could not tell her. From that day to this that home has been sheer hell to that man. Numbers of similar instances could be given. Let us ask,

why did the young woman marry? Did she selfishly crave only a sheltered home and economic support without the desire fully to share the whole of life, physical, cultural and spiritual with her husband in complete coöperation? And why did the young man marry without ever having talked frankly through with his future life-companion just wnat marriage involved in all these aspects? Because of this lack of preparation the blundering young man may seem to his wife to be a beast, while she seems an unsympathetic iceberg. He is not a beast, and she is not an iceberg, but without instruction they may unconsciously begin to thwart one another. At the very outset lasting impressions may be made which may mar or finally disrupt the marriage.

Sometimes these false impressions and fears begin in early childhood. A well-known woman in public life, when a little girl, innocently ran out of her bath into the room where there were guests. She was so punished for this, and the dread and fear of sex were so impressed upon her, she was later so continuously imbued with prejudice and fear by her well-meaning parents, that it finally led to misunderstanding and maladjustment, and ended in divorce and the wreck of her married life.

We would maintain that almost the first condition of happiness in marriage is a sane and healthy attitude toward sex and the physical side of life, coupled with the necessary information, sympathy and understanding for two lives successfully to function. Physical fitness may be shown by a mutual physical attraction which may indicate a deep harmony between the two physical natures. This physical attraction should be the foundation for a life friendship and companionship. On the other hand, if one is socially conditioned by fear it may be hard to unlearn false ascetic attitudes.

In the study made by Dr. Katherine B. Davis of the sex

life of a thousand intelligent and socially successful women, it was found that there was a definitely larger proportion of happy marriages among those who had been instructed beforehand. There is a growing body of literature available upon this important subject.

Probably the best single introduction to the study of sex problems for young men and women with a religious background will be found in Herbert Gray's *Men, Women and God.* This is especially valuable in giving one the right attitude and approach to the subject, in making it natural, beautiful and spiritual. And this is especially necessary to correct the fears, phobias and false views that have resulted from our taboo of silence and our policy of ignorance. Maude Royden's *Sex and Common Sense* is also a good introduction to the subject. Havelock Ellis, the greatest authority on these subjects, in his classic, *Little Essays of Love and Virtue,* also gives us a valuable introduction, though it is concerned only with principles. All of these three books, however, are quite insufficient, for invaluable as they are in spirit and attitude, they do not give the specific information needed for marriage.

After reading any of the above, we would suggest for all young women without exception before marriage, Margaret Sanger's *Happiness in Marriage.* Had this book alone been read, it would have saved many failures in marriage. For thousands of unhappy women this book would have shown the way not only to happiness but to health and harmony, if it had been known and followed. It shows the point at which many women are left unsatisfied in their lives, resulting often in a nervous breakdown, because of the ignorance of both the husband and the wife as to woman's biological part in marriage.

We have a number of books that are fairly satisfactory as a general introduction to sex problems, and for youth of

various ages. We have excellent sociological literature on marriage and the home. It is when we turn to books for married people that we find the greatest need and the greatest dearth. It is not too much to say that in this field there is not as yet a single satisfactory book in the English language that specifically states just what married people need to know, that is written in a satisfactory style, and that is available for general circulation. There are several books, however, that at least give the needed information and there are two at present in manuscript that if published will be better than any of these. The best books may be ordered from The Book Room, 600 West 122nd Street, New York City.[1]

In addition to reading one or more of the above books we would urge those about to be married to consult their family physician or the best doctor available without fail. Many painful situations and maladjustments could be avoided if the long experience of the physician were made available to the young.

Upon entering marriage, information alone is not enough. There must be sympathy and understanding. Men and women must know and appreciate their deep differences in nature. These differences today are doubtless largely due to convention, to education, and the almost complete artificial separation between the sexes in the past. For centuries the men were expected to do the fighting, hunting, agriculture, and manual labor. They usually reserved to themselves the monopoly of the higher vocations, even in religion. The women were assigned to the tasks of home-making, cooking, the bearing and rearing of children and the domestic arts. Women were often reduced to a status of slavery, as servants in the business of life, or a source of pleasure in its leisure.

[1] In writing for books time will be saved if it is clearly stated whether the writer is married or single, and upon what subjects information is desired. Books for those who are married may also be ordered from the Rational Life Publishing Co., Ithaca, N. Y.

There inevitably followed a general maladjustment in the relations between the sexes and a victimizing of women from which they have never yet fully recovered. Women are today the undiscovered continent of life, the area of highest potentiality of humanity. Man has had his innings; it is now woman's turn. We have yet to discover the contribution to the common life of an emancipated womanhood, and of the two sexes fully coöperating in healthy and equal comradeship.

Most wide generalizations are only partially true and are often misleading, but perhaps we may say in general that sex in man is usually more concentrated, more intense, aggressive, imperious, imperative, and sometimes ruthless. His passion is more imperious and harder to control. But it is also more intermittent. Man loves more ardently, then turns to his work again, while love is perpetual in woman. This sometimes leads to misunderstanding and unhappiness. Sex in woman is more diffused, and it is usually more constant, more loyal, more complete and consuming. In her relation to her husband and children it often fills her whole life. Thus Byron says:

> Man's love is of man's life a thing apart,
> 'Tis woman's whole existence.

Man intermittently rises to higher mountain peaks, and descends to deeper valleys. Woman responds more slowly but she finally moves consistently on a high and more even tableland of experience. Man may reach his climax in sexual intercourse and finish the short circuit of his sexual life in a few minutes. The woman may get a like temporary satisfaction, but to complete the long circuit of what sex entails for her, takes many months, often of pain, and years of costly care of the young. It is she who makes the major sacrifices. For the male, sex is a stimulant and a luxury;

for the female it is often a costly necessity entailing almost endless sacrifice. Women today are largely the result of man's selective choice in the past. They are often quicker of wit, more precocious, they develop more rapidly, have more instinctive tact, are more indirect and have been compelled for centuries to obtain their ends by strategy rather than by force. Women are at present nearer to nature, nearer to the child, stronger in intuition and in quick perception. They are generally more personal and emotional, less abstract and rational, under the pressure of a man-made double standard. Woman has developed powers of intuition and insight, of creation, of endurance, of tenderness and foresight. Her mind is more penetrative. Man has developed more discursive habits of judgment and reasoning, with powers of acquisition, combativeness and self-assertion.

Woman is the more patient and heroic and can bear more. Both sexes are equal, however, in their capacity to make each other suffer. Man is emotionally the weaker sex. Though the more independent, he secretly longs for anchorage, for protection, for comfort. Born of the long period of dependence upon the mother, during the years of impressionable childhood, many men unconsciously bring to adult years a feeling of inferiority toward women. This the man often covers by a masquerade of masculine egotism, assuming a pose of superiority or autocracy which frequently occasions a hidden warfare in married life. Indeed, many of the conflicts of marriage are caused by the fact that we do not understand the other sex, and often not our own. Each needs the other, and each fractional self is restless till it rests in a harmonious relationship with its true mate of the opposite sex. The two sexes are in a state of tension, one with the other. This may be constructive, creative, stimulative and harmonious; or it may become destructive, competitive and embittering. In man the sex instinct is primary and

the paternal instinct secondary and latent. In woman the maternal instinct is primary, and the sex instinct secondary and latent.

There is no place for the conception of either as superior or inferior. Hitherto men have had the best of almost everything and have taken advantage of their position. Is there not need to recognize and conserve the strong points of both as they supplement each other, and in absolute equality and more generous coöperation together seek to work out the destiny of each? For instance, can woman achieve both a career and a home, or must one be sacrificed to the other? It may require the coöperation of both sexes to solve this difficult problem.

2. *Conjugal Love* has grown out of the association of man and wife.

From life's physical basis spring many of its cultural and spiritual sublimations. Biologically, life may be founded in the physical but it must not be arrested there in its development. Sex as a single impulse is unsteady, intermittent and untrustworthy. If it is not completed in comradeship and parenthood it may become selfish and tyrannous. Even physical experiences in mating reach their full satisfaction only when they express the whole personality in the form of love. "To be of supreme importance to one's mate; to have a partner who understands and shares one's bitterest sorrows and supremest joys; to have the rest of life set on fire with loveliness through the thought of one's lover—such experiences as these are the summit of happiness. He who has missed them has missed the greatest things. He who sacrifices them for mere physical functioning is exchanging Aladdin's lamp for a bright tin kerosene flare."

Only love, deep, lasting and growing, affords an adequate basis for a happy marriage. It is the love of husband and wife that constitutes marriage rather than a civil or religious

ceremony. Love springs from the heart. It cannot be created or coerced by state or church. William Penn well said: "Never marry but for love, but see that thou lovest what is lovely."

By its fruit of love the root of sex may be known. And the root is as pure as the fruit. The glorious fact about sex is that it makes possible the experience of being in love, that beautiful and imperious emotion which so masters and transforms both men and women. What is this mysterious force that releases, as it were, some secret inner spring in the depths of one's nature, so that life becomes now centered in this new experience and the face of all the world is changed, so long as love lasts?

> Two shall be born the whole wide world apart, . . .
> And one day, out of darkness, they shall stand
> And read life's meaning in each other's eyes.

How many of us will know this deep reality of conjugal love as described by Mrs. Browning?

> How do I love thee? Let me count the ways.
> I love thee to the depth and breadth and height
> My soul can reach, when feeling out of sight
> For the ends of being and ideal grace.
> I love thee to the level of every day's
> Most quiet need, by sun and candle-light.
> I love thee freely, as men strive for right.
> I love thee purely, as they turn from praise.
> I love thee with the passion put to use
> In my old griefs, and with my childhood's faith.
> I love thee with the love I seemed to lose
> With my lost saints,—I love thee with the breath,
> Smiles, tears, of all my life!—and, if God choose,
> I shall but love thee better after death.

Such a love as this, physical, intellectual, spiritual, neither sensual nor ascetic, that was the normal experience and yet the daily wonder of Robert and Elizabeth Barrett Browning,

is not confined to geniuses, who are frequently not as happy as more ordinary people, but may be the experience of a growing number of those who fulfill the simple but searching conditions of marriage.

> Love is the emotion which arises when two personalities stimulate, facilitate and reinforce each other—when they function together in progressive integration. But if they thwart each other in physical functioning, in spiritual aspiration, or even in seemingly trivial tastes and wishes, if they hamper, or coerce, or defraud, or enslave one another, then marriage becomes a disaster.[2]

Marriage offers the maximum opportunity for developing love between two persons. It also offers the maximum exposure for developing friction. The problem is to minimize and overcome the points of friction and to magnify and develop the love. The central and crucial condition of happiness in marriage is love. Make sure that you have it before entering marriage and then guard it, not so much as the one pearl of great price, whose price indeed is above rubies, but as a tender plant, a sensitive plant if you will, but a vital organism requiring the sunlight and air of nature, and the nurture of man.

Love must grow or decline. Because love is a vital relationship of life and because life is never static but dynamic and developing, love also must expand. We grow by expression; what is not expressed dies. Love, most of all, because it is the full sharing of life, must express itself. It does not thrive in silence. It must be told and ever retold again. It must be ever recaptured and renewed. It must not be allowed to wither and die of inanition and neglect. It must be continuously recreated and wooed and won afresh.

[2] "Unsuccessful Marriages—Why?" in *The World Tomorrow,* June, 1927, p. 261.

Herein lies the miracle of love and of life itself. Like the splendor of each new dawn, it may be new every morning and fresh every moment. In the words of Charles Kingsley:

> Marriage is the life-long miracle,
> The self-begetting wonder, daily fresh.

Happiness is essential for the growth of love; and happiness is found in the harmonious exercise of function in life, especially in the harmonious expression and development of love. Each act may become the dull repetition of a meaningless monotony, or the fine expression of a love that shares, that cares, that appreciates, that tells the beloved by look and word and act of homage, the daily wonder of eternal love.

> An idle poet, here and there,
> Looks round him; but, for all the rest,
> The world, unfathomably fair,
> Is duller than a witling's jest.
> *Love wakes men, once a lifetime each;*
> They lift their heavy lids, and look;
> And lo, what one sweet page can teach,
> They read with joy, then shut the book.[3]

But why shut the book of life, why not read on in the endless lessons of love? Love partakes of the infinite, for "love is of God." Wise husband, tell your love and it will grow; forget it and it will wither like an unwatered plant. Young wife, tell your love as well, for there must be an equal sharing in this life of love and you must rid yourself of the false notion that your part is always passive, to suffer in silence when you are apparently forgotten, for therein you are doubly responsible if you remain silent. *You* have not forgotten, and yours is the gift to be the leader here, if love is to grow by expression and not to wither and die.

[3] Covetry Patmore, *The Angel in the House,* italics ours.

3. *Common Interests.*

Here, perhaps, is the central secret of successful marriage. This follows from our definition of marriage as entire community of life between two persons. Physical functioning may be basically important, especially in early married life. Love may, like electricity, furnish the "light, heat and power" that set the whole life aglow, that motivate and energize it. But even love must be nourished. Love is an art that must be learned. All marriage is a process of sharing. That is what it is for. Mere sex hunger may be satisfied in the roving life of the savage or the libertine. Of the great basic institutions on which our social order is founded—the home, the school, industry, the church and the state—the first, marriage as realized in the home, is the primal, fundamental unit of society. Its secret is mutual growth in personality through shared interests. While sexual love may be the beginning, it cannot be the end of a home, for it tends to be selfish, to be short-circuited, to diminish. Love must wane unless it is linked to some great and growing purpose. Much as it treasures its sacred and romantic past, it must press on toward an even greater future if it is to survive. And this can only be realized in common interests growingly shared.

Whatever may be said of the past, *if modern marriage is to be fully successful it must be democratically founded on the four corner stones of liberty, equality, coöperation and growth.* There must first of all be *freedom* for two personalities to develop. The influence of the survival of the old patriarchal family, where man is the natural autocrat or czar of the home, often still lingers. But the very essence of personality is freedom. In no other atmosphere can it grow. The very man who unconsciously begins autocratically to dominate the home ends by not respecting the unselfish helpmate he has partially crushed. Does the husband really want

a mere permanent housekeeper, a faithful drudge, an unpaid servant, or does he desire a real life companion and a friend who will help him to rise to his best? Then he must pay the price of giving full and unquestioned freedom as the only condition upon which an equal can so develop.

The young wife, also, while glorying in the joy of sacrifice, must be on her guard against spoiling both husband and children. She should with quiet dignity take her place of full equality in the home from the start and not herself be responsible for unconsciously helping to make her husband an autocrat or her children selfish.

And there must be *equality* in the democratic home. Nothing is easier than to admit this in theory and yet deny it in practice. The man starts with an enormous advantage both by tradition and circumstance, the woman with a similar handicap in her necessary sacrifice for the home and children. Here again a price must be paid. If the man has all the privilege—his work, his broadening touch with the world, his life in public and private, the stimulus of his profession or business; and if the woman has all the handicaps, all the drudgery, all the housework, all the monotony, all the bearing and rearing of the children, for years shut in to the narrow world of a single home, then the two may unconsciously and unwittingly begin to grow apart. They drift apart because their interests are different and also because their characters become different. The only hope is to maintain equality through common interests constantly shared. There must be as far as possible equality of opportunity, equality in financial status, equality in responsibility and equality in work. If the man is not willing to grant this both in theory and in practice, it is usually because there is a lurking feeling in his mind that woman is man's inferior. One test here will be that of financial equality. Does the husband regard all the income as his own, and his wife's work as financially valueless, or shall they together work out

a family budget and make this a further occasion of sharing? Must the wife ask the husband for money for every item that she spends, or is there a mutually agreed upon allowance, for both husband and wife, or a division of the family income, concerning her portion of which the wife shall have equal freedom in expenditure? A budget tends to give recognition of income as a family and not an individual possession. It helps toward a fair division of funds and toward the education of the whole family in economy, saving and mutual responsibility.

Another test of equality will be in the practical sharing of some of the tasks of the home. Because of the habits of our present economic system it will probably be necessary at least for some time for women to do the bulk of the house work and it would not be possible or fair for the man, tired after his day in business, to do a full half of the work in the home. Woman is the home maker and the home maintainer. She is the center of every true home. The natural preference of most women will make the home their particular specialization. But let the husband remember that his wife is tired also, probably more than he is. If the man takes no share in the work of the home, he will as a result probably take less interest in it and have little appreciation of what his wife is doing.

Both the work of the office and of the kitchen may be made either a drudgery or a sacrament of life. One may toil at the oar as a chained galley slave, or as a joyous athlete. Each step may be taken as in a plodding treadmill, or as the mountain climber whose eyes are on the heights. Work, for man and woman, is just what we make it.

> A servant with this clause
> Makes drudgery divine;
> Who sweeps a room as for thy laws,
> Makes that and the action fine.

The writer was much impressed in taking dinner with a

young couple recently to see the husband and wife together go out to the kitchen to wash and wipe the dishes. As an engineer, used to scientific management, the man had tried to bring his best thought to bear on the efficiency of the home as well as of his business, and together they had reduced their record for washing and wiping the dishes to less than ten minutes. As a wise wife she left some things to be done the next day and then accompanied her husband to the living room to share in their reading and cultural tastes. Let us suppose instead that the husband had retreated at once to his smoke and reading and his wife had spent a long evening in the kitchen alone. If they should continue this habit during a course of years, how much will she have to share when she does come into the living room?

The writer was even more impressed by an old couple of seventy who sit every evening hand in hand under the study lamp, the husband with his scientific or technical book in his hand, and the wife with her own book or paper in hers. This couple are still on their honeymoon, they are still growing together. In all such mutuality, however, the woman must justify the sharing by giving her energies to things which command the respect of her husband. *The alternatives are, through shared interests growing together, or else growing apart.*

How many will be able to say, as did Ramsay MacDonald, former British Prime Minister, of his wife:

> To turn to her in stress and storm was like going into a sheltered haven where waters were at rest, and smiling up into the face of Heaven. Weary and worn, buffeted and discouraged, thinking of giving up the thankless strife . . . I would flee with her to my Buckinghamshire home, and my lady would heal and soothe me with her cheery faith and steady conviction, and

> send me forth to smite and be smitten. No one, not even I, can tell with accuracy how much of the steadiness there is in the labor movement in this country due to her.[4]

May we here repeat that by common interests shared we mean those of two free personalities, as in the case of Ramsay MacDonald and his wife. We do not mean the absorption or obliteration of either personality. Both will have to maintain mutual reserves. Intimacy can be overdone. A cheapening familiarity may breed contempt. A husband and wife may easily get upon one another's nerves. They may occasionally need vacations from, as well as with, one another. Yet they will need to learn to play together as well as to work together. Make the home a place of peace and joy. People usually get married in order to be happy, rather than to be improved. Don't regulate too much. A habit of ceaseless criticism will wear out the affection of husband, wife or child. Do not let the word "don't" become too frequent in your vocabulary. Among the causes of failure in marriage we might enumerate: the incapacity to see another's point of view, and the tendency to magnify every fault and limitation; humiliation through the constant harping of disapproval and criticism; harsh, unsympathetic, puritanical judgment of superimposed, external, legal standards; and the misery of attempting to mix incompatible temperaments.

The third corner-stone of the successful home is *coöperation.* It is not enough to let each other alone. There must be a real integration of purpose in the merging of activities for common ends. Together the young couple may gradually build their home, educate their children, share in their social intercourse and in recreation. Together they will share as a common responsibility the problems of the husband's busi-

[4] *Iconoclast,* J. Ramsay MacDonald.

ness and those of the wife in the home. Together they will build their ideals and their personalities.

> The happy home is built upon the wedding of the *purposes* of the husband and wife. They must want to achieve things together, to pool their efforts for common goals. If a man and woman find their lives opening up into each other, if they find that each releases, stimulates, glorifies, and develops the potentialities of the other, if they find that together they can experience and accomplish splendid things impossible to them separately, then they are on the highroad to the most beautiful and fruitful relationship. But if the husband finds his strivings and aspirations thwarted and repressed by the wife, if the wife experiences repeated blockings of her activities and purposes by the husband, then the relationship is headed for disaster. If, then, the inner drives in life of a husband and wife are fundamentally alien, if one of them seeks a kind of home and a way of living essentially inconsistent with the home and life sought by the other, the winning of harmony becomes a well-nigh impossible task.[5]

Finally, the *growth* of the personalities in the home is an important condition of its happiness. The ever-present danger of the individual and especially of the home is the inertia of stagnant monotony. If without imagination or ideals life is limited to a petty round of domestic duties, and the narrowed horizon of four familiar walls the home becomes a dreary treadmill. Women as well as men long to explore life's inexhaustible possibilities of intellectual and social achievement. Compare the youth of twenty-one who recently committed suicide because he thought he had "ex-

[5] *The Science of Social Relations*, pp. 391-402. Quoted with the kind permission of Henry Holt and Co.

perienced all that life had to offer"—a petty round soon tasted, of eating, drinking, petting and sex experience—with the adventure of two growing personalities like Robert and Elizabeth Barrett Browning.

Because of their very differences two personalities may share in the joy of the discovery of the new, the joy of daring and of battle together for a common cause, the joy of creative work well done, the joy of moral mastery and self-discipline, the joy of service and sacrifice. Together they may discover that happiness is not solitary but social, it is found not in getting but in giving, not in withholding but in sharing; it is not selfish but sacrificial; it is not outward but inward, not in things but in persons, not in strife but in concord, not in lovelessness but in love. This implies a life-long adventure. We repeat again—*love is an art that must be learned* by both parties, by constantly expanding the area of their shared interests. Marriage is thus a work of art rather than of nature.

"The whole art of love lies in forever finding something new in the same person." But there must be something new there to discover. We must not only discover but create it. That means, again, room for two personalities to grow and develop. Love is the sunshine in which the best in us grows; unsympathetic criticism is a blight that withers. It is the duty and privilege of each of us to call out ever new possibilities in the life-partner by the creative companionship of love. As Browning says: "Every man has two soul sides—one to face the world with and one to show a woman when he loves her."

THE PERMANENT ELEMENTS OF FAMILY LIFE *

HENRY FREDERICK COPE

In the death of Henry Frederick Cope in August of 1923, America lost one of her most distinguished scholars in the field of religious education. Mr. Cope was born at London, England, on June 17, 1870. He received his elementary education in London and at the Government Boy's School, Enfield, South Kensington. In 1891 he came to this country. He entered the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary at Louisville, Kentucky, and was ordained to the Baptist Ministry in the year 1893. The next ten years of his life were spent in the Pastorate and in teaching, and in 1907 he became General Secretary of the Religious Education Association. In 1908 he received his degree of B.A. from Ripon College and an honorary M.A. from Oberlin College in 1911, and the same year a D.D. from Washburn College. He married Elizabeth Erwin of Hornby, New York, in the year 1893, who survives him.

He was a member of the Union League, The Quadrangle, and The Chicago Literary Club.

He was editor of *Adams Primer,* on teaching, 1905; *The Aims of Religious Education,* 1906; *The Materials of Religious Education,* 1907; *Education and National Character,* 1908; and *The Religious Education Magazine* from 1906 until his death. He is the author of numerous articles on religious education dealing particularly with the family, the Bible School, the Church, and the community.

1. *The Dominant Motive*

THE chief end of society is to improve the race, to develop the higher and steadily improving type of human beings. We can test the life of the family and determine the values of its elements by asking whether and in what degree they minister to this end, the growth of better persons. This is more than a theoretical aim or one conceived in a search for

* From *Religious Education in the Family* by Henry F. Cope. Copyrighted and published, 1915, by the University of Chicago Press and reprinted in this volume with their permission and that of Mrs. Cope.

ideals. It is written plain in our passions and strongest inclinations. That which parents supremely desire for their children is that they may become strong in body, capable and alert in mind, and animated by worthy principles and ideals. The parent desires a good man, fit to take his place, do his work, make his contribution to the social well being, able to live to the fulness of his powers, to take life in all its reaches of meaning and heights of vision and beauty. In true parenthood all hopes of success, of riches, fame, and ease, are seen but as avenues to this end, as means of making the finer character, of growing the ideal person. If we were compelled to choose for our children we should elect poverty, pain, disgrace, toil, and suffering if we knew this was the only highway to full manhood and womanhood, to completeness of character. Indeed, we do constantly so choose, knowing that they must endure hardness, bear the yoke in their youth, and learn that:

> Love and joy are torches lit
> At altar fires of sacrifice.

With this dominating purpose clearly in mind we are prepared to ask: What are the elements of family life which among the changes of today we need most carefully to preserve in order to maintain efficiency in character development? In days when the outer shell of domestic arrangements changes, when readjustments are being made in the organization of the family, what is there too precious to lose, so worthy and essential that we waste no time when seeking to maintain it?

2. *Potencies to be Preserved—Social Qualities*

The first great element to be preserved in all family life is that of the power of the small group for purposes of character development. The infant's earliest world is the mother's

arms. In order to grow into a man fitted for the wider world of social living, he must learn to live in a world within his comprehension. A child's life moves through the widening circles of mother care, family group, neighborhood, school, city, state, and nation into world-living. He must take the first steps before he is able to take the next ones. He must learn to live with the few as preparation for living with the many. In earliest infancy he takes his first unconscious lessons in the fine art of living with other folks as he relates himself to parents and to brothers and sisters.

Secondly, the family life affords the best agency for social training. The family is the ideal democracy into which the child-life is born. Here habits are formed, ideals are pictured, and life itself is interpreted. It is an ideal democracy, first, because it is a social organization existing for the sake of persons. The family comes nearer to fulfilling the true ideal of a democratic social order than does any other institution. It is founded to bring lives into this world; it is maintained for the sake of those lives; all its life, its methods, and standards are determined, ideally, by the needs of persons. It is an ideal democracy, secondly, because its guiding principle is that the greater lives must be devoted to the good of the lesser, the parent for the little child, the older members for the younger, in an attempt to extend to the very least the greatest good enjoyed by all. Thirdly, ideally it is a true democracy in that it gives to each member a share in its own affairs and develops the power to bear responsibilities and to carry each his own load in life. Thus the family group is the best possible training for the life and work of the larger group, the state, and for world-living. The maintenance of the ideals of the state, as a democracy, depends on the continuance of this institution with its peculiar power to train life in infancy and childhood for the life of manhood in the state. Such training can be given only in the smaller group

that is governed by the motives peculiar to home and family life. The power to impress these principles depends on the size of the group. The small social organization, the family circle of from three members to even a dozen, bound by ties of affection, is the one great, efficient school, training youth to live in social terms.

Thirdly, the family sets spiritual values first. Our age especially needs men and women who think in terms of spiritual values, who rise above the measures of pounds and dollars and weigh life by personal qualities and worth. That is precisely what the home does. It prizes most highly the helpless, economically worthless infant; it measures every member by his personal character, his affectional worth. Its riches do not depend on that which money can buy, but on the personal qualities of love, goodness, kindness; on memories, associations, affection. The true home gives to every child-life the power to choose the things of the world on the basis of their warmth in personality. Only the mistaken judgments of later years, the short-minded wisdom of the world, make youth gradually lose the habit of preferring the home's spiritual benefits to the material rewards of the world of business. No life can be furnished for the strain of our modern materialism that lacks the basis of idealism furnished in the true family.

3. *Potencies to be Preserved—The Moral Life*

Fourthly, the power of family living to develop love as loyalty is to be noted. In this small group is laid the foundation of the moral life. "The family is the primer in the moral education of the race." Here the new-born life begins to relate itself to other lives. Here it begins life in an atmosphere saturated by love, the central principle of all virtue, eventually loyalty to ideals in persons and devotion to them, "the greatest of these," because it is the parent of all virtue.

The moral life, that life which is adjusted, capable, and adequately motived for helpful, efficient, enriching living with all other lives, is not a matter of rules, regulations, and restrictions. Neither is it a matter of separate habits as to this or the other kind of behavior, though this comes nearer to it than do rules and prescriptions. The character-life which parents desire for their children is not that which will do the right thing when it has discovered that right thing in some book of rules, nor that life which will do the right thing because society points that way, nor even that life which automatically does the right thing, but it is the life which, constantly moved by some high inner compulsion, some imperative of vision and ideal, moves to the highest possible plane of action in every situation. This is the life of loyalty. It begins with loyalty to persons, with that devotion which begins with affection. In no other place is this so well developed as in the relations of the family. This is the child's first and most potential school. Here the lessons are wholly unconscious; here they are strengthened by the pleasurable emotions. It is a joy to be loyal to those we love. Indeed, who can tell which comes first, the joy, the loyalty, or the love?

The power of this small social group of the family to develop the fundamental principle of loyalty, the root of all virtues, gives a position of great importance to the affections in the family. We do well to contend for the maintenance of conditions of family living which will strengthen the ties of affection. If children could be thrust into the care of the state, in large groups, separated from parental care and oversight, it is difficult to see what emotional stimulus toward affection would remain. The personal devotion to intimate adults would in only the smallest degree compensate for the loss of father and mother. We know nothing of such devotion arising to any large degree in orphan asylums, still less

in institutions under the cold and impersonal care of the state. It has been urged that the affections of parents stand in the way of a scientific regimen and education for small children. The cold, passionless, automatic parent, then, would be the ideal—a Mr. Dombey or a Mr. Feverel. Parents make many mistakes, but these mistakes are not due to too much affection, but to untrained minds and uneducated affections. It were better to save the values of their affections and on them to build a wise discipline for childhood by providing adequate training of parents for their duties.

Fifthly, there are some elements of the cost of family life, even its apparently unnecessary sacrifice and pain, that we do well to seek to keep. Character grows in paying the high price of maintaining a family. It is the most expensive form of living for adults. Marriages are now delayed because of the fear of the actual monetary cost; but far more serious is the cost in care, in nerves, in patience, in all the great elements of self-denial. No child ever knows what he has cost until he has children of his own. But this discipline of self-denial is that which saves us from selfishness. It is necessary to have some personal objects for which to give our lives if they are to be saved from centrifugation, from death through ingrowing affection. True, many bachelors and spinsters have learned the way of self-denying, fellow-serving love. But how can a true parent escape that lesson? Nor does it stop with parents; as children grow up together they, too, must learn mutual forbearance, conciliation, and, soon, the joy of service. One sees selfishness in the little child gradually fading in the practice of family service, helpfulness, consideration for others. The single child in a family misses something more important than playmates; he misses all the education of play and service. But who cannot remember many families that have grown to beauty of character under the discipline of home life, and especially when this has in-

volved real sacrifices? The stories in the Pepper books illustrate the spirit that blossoms under the trials and hardships of the struggle of a family for a livelihood and for the maintenance of a home.

A clear function becomes evident for this social group called the family. It is that of dealing with young lives, in groups bound by ties of blood and similarity, for purposes of the development of personal character. The family has an essentially educational function. Bearing in mind that "educational" means the orderly development of the powers of the life, we can think of our families as existing for this purpose and to be tested by their ability to do this work, especially by their ability to develop persons, young lives, that have the power, the vision, the acquired habits and experience to live as more than animals. The family is an educational institution dealing with child-life for its full growth and its self-realization, especially on character levels. The educational function suggests the features of family life which we do well to seek to preserve. Many incidental forms may pass, but the essential human relations and experiences that go to develop life and character must be maintained at any cost.

THE FUNCTION OF THE FAMILY *

ROBERT C. AND FRANCES WILLIAMS BINKLEY

Robert C. Binkley, now associate professor of History at Smith College, was born in Pennsylvania in the year 1897. He was educated at Stanford University, California, majoring in Modern European History. He is part author with Professor Malbone W. Graham of *The New Government of Central Europe,* 1925; and with Frances Williams Binkley of *What Is Right with Marriage, an Outline of Domestic Theory,* 1929.

Frances Williams Binkley was born in Idaho, 1899, and also was educated at Stanford University where they began collaborating by running a column of political comment in the San Francisco *Journal of Commerce.* They were married in the year 1924. Both Mr. and Mrs. Binkley write for magazines, Mr. Binkley usually on political matters and Mrs. Binkley on matters relating to marriage and the family.

ONE who is about to invest his life in marriage has no disposition to look for the consequences which ensue to the race or the world from marriage in general, whereof his own is an inconspicuous instance. That his own marriage, together with billions of others, may perpetuate the race and transmit the social heritage is a fact of meager importance to him. The Occidental does not marry in order to fulfill a public duty. In China, according to Keyserling, these general considerations motivate marriages, but this fact must be interpreted in connection with the submerging of the natural family in the Chinese household. Certainly in the Western World any man who should propose marriage to a girl out of

* From *What is Right with Marriage* by Robert C. and Frances W. Binkley,—copyright 1929 by Appleton and reprinted in this volume with the kind permission of both publisher and authors.

regard for the interests of society or race could hardly expect to have his argument taken seriously. Our own day is especially hostile to the idea of making marriage a matter of duty and obligation; here if anywhere the thing must be done for its own sake.

Marriage is by no means unique in this disparity between the social or racial functions it fulfills and the actual motives and purposes of the individuals who engage in it. The same thing is true of business. A stockbroker does not open his offices in order to aid in the important function of distributing economic goods, nor does a street car conductor take his job in order to assist in furnishing transportation to the community. However, there is this significant difference between the attitudes of a man in business and of a man and woman in marriage: that the men in business know exactly what they want, while those who marry are much less clear as to their purposes. The stockbroker wants "to make money," the conductor hopes "to make a living." They have been taught from childhood the meaning of business and the purpose of having a job. The bride and groom have received no such instruction; their purposes are more beautiful, more fanciful and more variable than the purposes of broker and conductor, but they are also less clear.

Can we not clarify these purposes, separate the possible from the fantastic, and discover that aim in marriage and that object in family life which have real and direct meaning to young people who are planning their lives? What must marriage give them if they are to regard it as a success?

It is fruitless to discuss the function or purpose of the family without establishing beforehand the point of view from which the discussion is to proceed. From the point of view of the human species as a whole, or of civilization in general, it might appear that the family fulfills this or that function. But from the point of view of the family these

same alleged "functions" might appear vain and meaningless.

We might imagine ourselves on the top of a high mountain, far removed from the turmoil of actual life, looking down upon countless little homesteads in the valleys below, and asking, "What end do these serve?" Around us would stretch the panorama of nature, its trees and its grasses and flowers, and of these we might also ask, "What end do they serve?" And we would recognize the artificiality of our question, for nature has no purposes. Still we might fix arbitrarily upon some fragment of the totality of nature, and ask how all the other things contribute to the persistence of the selected fragment. There are some cows grazing in a little glen, and with reference to these cows we can easily discover the function of the grass, the trees and the homesteads. The grass nourishes the cows, the trees offer them shade, the homesteads supply them with shelter. Or again we can direct our minds to the whole human species, and inquire how all of these things which lie before us contribute to the persistence of the human race. The grass and the cows and the trees all have their importance in this connection, and so also have the homesteads, and the families which inhabit the homesteads. The family, it may be, contributes to the welfare of the race and society, but this does not mean that welfare of the race and society are intrinsically the ends of the family. It is only the accidental turn of a query, and not the inevitable nature of the family itself, which can fix upon racial or social welfare as "ends" of domestic life.

We have defined the family, not as a social institution, but as something anterior to and independent of society. We are studying it, not as an element of social organization, but as a thing in nature. Hence we cannot judge it as if it existed for the sake of society; we must think of it as exist-

ing for itself. We have noted, furthermore, that family life has values which cannot be shared outside its circle. The family stands in isolation, as an autonomous system. Should we from the mountain top assign transcendent ends and purposes to the families, we should be denying the isolation and autonomy of the family. It there is an end toward which domestic life strives, this end must be something immanent within the family, not transcendent and reaching beyond it.

We leave the mountain top; we cease to inquire about the race or society; we come down into one of the cottages of the valley, and see a family sitting around the evening lamp. Here is an object in nature to be studied, as one might study a specimen of algæ, a mollusk, a colony of streptococci, or a eucalyptus tree. How can we attribute an end or aim to this entity which is set before our neutral gaze? How can we know whether this family is "successful" or not? We would not ordinarily think of ascribing ends and aims to mollusks and streptococci. These things are what they are, and the only aim we can possibly attribute to them is the aim of continuing stubbornly to be what they are. The separate organs or parts of these things have indeed their functions; the valves, muscles, chlorophyl, cells, sap, neuclei, all have their ends in the maintenance of the organism. Our concept of "organism" permits us to ascribe functions to the *parts,* but to the organism as a *whole,* studied in isolation, we can assign no functions whatsoever. Analogously, when we study the family *per se* the only functioning that we can discover is an interrelated activity of the members, not a service which the total family renders to something else. The functioning of the family is not a matter of what the family does or fails to do for the world, but a matter of what the family members do or fail to do for each other. The only end or purpose which we can properly attribute

to the family is one which relates on the one hand to the actions, on the other to the intentions of the members thereof.

Out of what combination of intention and achievement, of will and of act, is there compounded this thing which we seek as "success" in marriage?

From the point of view of the individual family member why should one marry at all? What contribution will marriage make to one's life? What purpose is intrinsic to a marriage project?

To have children? But why have children? From the standpoint of the race, of course, they are necessary, and it is the "function" of the family to produce them. But from the standpoint of those who marry they are simply prospective members of the very organism which is under discussion. Why bring this organism into existence? To say that one marries in order to have children is psychologically less accurate and logically no more satisfactory than to say that one marries in order to have a husband or a wife.

There is indeed that important difference between the status of husband and wife and the status of children: the former are necessary to the existence of a family, the latter only contingent. That which is implicit in the sex side of marriage is not the certainty, but the possibility only, of having children.

The development of a technique of contraception in the Western World has tended to bring about a separation of the idea of marriage from the idea of child-breeding. It is safe to say that if only those couples were allowed to obtain marriage licenses whose primary object in marrying was to beget children, the revenues of county clerks and clergymen would be seriously curtailed. But the old fact of contingency remains: the device used to induce fertility, be it a witch-doctor's charm or a gynecologist's diet prescription, is just

as subject to uncertainty as the device used to prevent conception. And whether children are born of the union or not, the family continues.

It will be necessary to go more deeply than is here possible into the problem of values which confronts those who try to decide whether they want their marriage to be childless or fertile. In the meantime one cannot beg the question by assuming out of hand that the only object of marriage is to beget offspring. It may be that the logic of the marriage situation is such that childless marriages are inevitably failures, and that the procreation of children is a precondition of successful family life. But even a fertile marriage may be a failure. A search must be made for some principles of purpose or function which will encompass the barren marriage along with the fertile, and which will apply no less to the aged families that have had children than to the young families which are about to have them.

It cannot be disputed that the total sex situation, which includes the possibility of children, has given the family its fundamental tone and character. But it may be that the family may have risen above its source, and that out of a child-breeding function it may have created a system of values which can exist without children. If this transmutation has taken place, it is only another instance of that general law which Vaihinger once wished to formulate as "the law of the preponderance of the means over the end." The qualities of family life which originate as a means for caring for offspring may have become ends in themselves.

Were it not for the development of a technique of contraception on the one hand, and the so-called "emancipation of woman" on the other, we might never have had to face the problem of discovering some broader and more universal principle of success in family life than the biological principle. Were it not for the appearance in civilized life of

vast nonbiological value-systems, æsthetic and ethical, we might not be in a position to appreciate or understand any other function of family life than the biological one. But the facts as they stand in the Western World today indicate that the child-breeding function does not suffice to explain the family in terms of the purposes of its members, nor is the fecundity of a marriage an adequate test of its success.

In every civilization much of the actual intention of those who marry reflects the prevailing social code. They marry in order to secure that which they are taught to expect in marriage. This influence of social pressure upon the purposes of family members is evident in the attitude toward child-breeding. Married people tend to reflect in their own minds the community's appraisal of the importance of having children. In some communities large families are much esteemed and childless marriages looked upon with contempt. In other communities the parents of a large family are pitied, and the childless couple viewed without condemnation. Needless to say, a married pair will be more likely to leave children out of their calculations if the sentiment of the community approves of childless marriages.

In this respect as in others, the sentiment of the community is often a product of some real social need. Among warlike or colonizing people fecundity will usually be highly valued; among peoples who are living near the limit of their food supply, or among those who have developed wide luxury tastes, social approval may be withdrawn from the extremely fecund marriage. This is the situation in some Polynesian communities and in American cities. The modern rationalization of this attitude is a comprehensive doctrine of population growth which teaches that the result of breeding up to the biological potentialities of the race would be unmitigated disaster.

It is not only with respect to child-breeding that the com-

munity tries to define the purposes of family members and to measure the success of families. Many elements of family life are subject to community judgment. Where polygamy is the rule, it may be that the man who has the greatest number of most valuable wives and concubines is accounted to have the most satisfactory family, just as the pair who have the largest brood of children may be looked upon as most successful in the community which approves of fecundity.

The principle of conformity to conventional standards, however, is not a satisfactory principle of success in marriage. It is a principle which relates to the family institution, but not to the natural family. The scope and limitations, as well as the mechanism, of the community's influence upon the family members, have been analyzed in the chapter on Conventions and the Family. It is clear that the most important movements of family life go on beyond the reach of the community.

Most of the judgments we actually pass upon some one else's family are a resultant of our own socially-given standards rather than an attempt to measure an absolute excellence in family life. If we discover that a traveling salesman living at Newark, New Jersey, has an extra wife in Omaha, we jump to the conclusion that his marriages are both failures, whereas it may be, for all one knows, that save for the intervention of the law both marriages are successful. Or again, if a wealthy banker maintains in the same city a wife and several mistresses, we declare without further inquiry that his family life is ruined. But if we lived in another society, we should draw opposite conclusions from the same facts. The Chinese hold that it is correct to yield to the mother-in-law the dominant position in the household; Americans regard such an abdication as lamentable or laughable. Wherever in our judgments on the success or

failure of a marriage we find ourselves merely judging conformity to our own institutional rules, our attitude is blind, and leaves us helpless.

For it happens that at the present time our institutional rules for family life are uncertain; our system of social conventions relative to marriage is changing under the pressure of criticism; the young people may be willing enough to conform and to accept conformity as a test of success, but how are they to choose among the contradictory marriage institutions which demand their conformity?

The ideal of monogamy and of contract marriage rather than purchase marriage they find well enough established in their milieu, but aside from this the conventions are in conflict. What of trial marriage, companionate marriage, birth control, woman's place? To mention any one of the leading problems of marriage is to call to mind another instance where social guidance fails us, and where we must choose between conflicting rules, certain, however we may decide, that some people will approve and others condemn.

Conformity to convention is not a test of domestic values. The conventions which demand conformity are themselves among the things requiring to be tested. The confusion in social guidance which the Western World offers to those who marry is evidenced both directly and indirectly. Directly there is a cross fire of propaganda emanating from different schools and expounding divergent ideals of domestic life. The slogans of free love, eugenics, feminism, and conservatism are irreconcilable. The ideal of eugenics, which stresses the biological significances of marriage, contradicts the ideal of free love, although Ellen Key tried to conceal this contradiction by pretending that children born of parents who loved each other inherited a superior endowment in consequence of the subjective state of the parents at the time of conception. Ellen Key's hypothesis, of course, has

no standing in the science of genetics. The appeal which feminism makes for a sex solidarity among women is basically more opposed to the free love ideal than to the conservative ideal of woman's domestic sphere. The confusion of ideals is not only a conflict between conservatism and novelty, but also a conflict between contradictory proposals of innovation.

The indirect source of confusion in social standards of domestic life lies in the social, economic, and intellectual changes of the last century which have brought it about that the services once rendered to an individual by his family are now rendered to him by other agencies. Professor Ogburn lists seven services which the family rendered to our ancestors, namely:

1. Economic
2. Religious
3. Protective
4. Educational
5. Recreational
6. Status-defining
7. Affectional

According to Professor Ogburn, it lies at the root of modern family disorganization that six out of the seven functions of the family are lapsing in modern life. People are coming to look elsewhere than to the family for these services, and groups other than the family are assuming these functions. A man's wife was his business partner in the day of the spinning wheel and in the environment of the milking shed, but not in the day of the can-opener and in the environment of the elevator and dumb-waiter. The religious meaning of the family was greatest when there were household gods to be worshiped; it was still great when the Bible was read by the head of the house while the

children sat around the table in silence; but in these present days religion is usually paid off, so far as the family is concerned, when the minister receives the envelope from the best man, or when the children are sent to Sunday School. The protective service given by husband to wife has been reduced to the formal gesture of escorting her home from the theater after dark, while for all real protection against danger or violence one turns to the telephone and the police. The training of children is committed more and more to a corps of teachers, and takes place more and more in institutions outside the home, from nursery school to college. The movies, the amusement parks, and the public playgrounds replace the home as a play center. Except for a few thousand families who preserve the traditions of a past age, social status is far more a matter of individual achievement than of family connection. There remains that service of function which Ogburn has called "affectional." Here and here only the domain of the family has not been invaded. No other social organ shows any tendency to usurp this function from the family; on the contrary, business and education are becoming constantly less personal and giving constantly less scope for the play of affection.

But the social conventions relating to marriage in the Western World have not yet adapted themselves to the new situation. People are therefore required to choose among competing standards, and cannot merely accept a prevailing standard. Were it not for this practical problem of choice, we might not have felt the need of searching for an absolute standard of excellence in family life, nor need we have occupied ourselves with the problem of defining the functions of the natural family.

Upon what universally valid principle can we act in choosing that system of conventions to which we will purpose to conform, and by which we will judge the success of a

family? If, confronted by this question, we turn upon ourselves for counsel, a native urge impels us to grasp at one of the things that seems to us ultimate—happiness. Let us by all means be happy; let us conform to the rules of that marriage institution which will make us glad, and turn aside from those conventions which sadden us. With happiness as a working standard we may go a little way, but we cannot go far, for happiness is not the kind of thing one can measure in a test tube. There is the happiness of the bacchante and the happiness of the contented cow. How can these be measured in and weighed against each other?

The test of happiness is difficult to apply. If marriages are happiest in which girls are "married young, treated rough, and told nothing," let us accept this as one of our marriage conventions, and let us then condemn the failure of those who marry mature women, treat them gently, and impart information to them. If the monogamous marriage is conducive to more gayety of spirit than the group marriage, let us convert the Polynesians to the Christian point of view and induce them to give up their heathenish practices. If, on the other hand, it appears that the group-marrying Polynesians get more joy out of the thing than the missionaries, let the missionaries be converted. If we observe that young people who practice birth control are gay, while those unacquainted with the technique are morose and serious, we conclude that the practice of birth control is a commendable addition to the line of conduct which society shall demand of married people. If virginity before marriage results in unhappy sex life, we will adopt the more hilarious practices of the numerous primitive people who do not permit virgins to marry, and we will condemn chastity before marriage as unsocial and unconventional conduct.

We may, if we wish, apply this test of happiness to all the marriage systems of the world and compare the joy of

being a Borneo bride with the pleasure of being an Eskimo husband. But our results will be inconclusive in two ways. First of all, the test of happiness is particularly hostile to the tradition of Christian marriage, for the Christian marriage has always been a compromise with sin, and has looked with contempt upon the mere joy of sex.

And then again, an institution cannot confer happiness. Happiness is a thing achieved by people individually. Let these young people accept whichever of the conflicting standards of conduct they see fit to choose—the problem of happiness remains unsolved for them. They still stand before life without any solid guarantee that happiness will be their reward for living according to the rules they have chosen.

If we no longer raise the question of conformity to socially-given rules, and the parallel question of selecting among contradictory rules, we are still tempted to judge the success of a married life by the happiness it grants. We wish to estimate the amount of pleasure enjoyed by the members of a family, and conclude that if this amount is large, the family is a success; if it is small, the family is a failure. We will discard all other classifications. We will not ask whether there were children, but only whether husband and wife are happy together. We will not inquire whether it is polygamous or monogamous, old-fashioned or companionate, but only whether the husband and wife enjoy themselves.

In connection with the scientific research conducted by Dr. G. V. Hamilton, a working definition of the happy marriage was drawn up by rating those persons as happily wedded who expressed satisfaction with their married state. This definition proved to be useful in classifying and evaluating the experiences of the two hundred married persons whose testimony was taken as a basis of the research. From the

retrospective standpoint this, after all, is the only test of a happy marriage. As a general ideal the concept is definite enough to be opposed to Keyserling's theory that marriage is essentially a tragic situation. But the definition is quite unserviceable in orienting the purposes of those who are planning to marry. Certainly the bride and groom intend so to conduct themselves that they will later be satisfied with what they have done. But what are the desires which marriage can satisfy? How are we to restrain those who demand too much of marriage, and thereby foredoom themselves to disappointment? How are we to educate those who fail to appreciate at their just worth the things that marriage offers, and thereby remain dissatisfied with their married life because they are blind to what it does for them? To propose as a solution to those problems the judgment that the thing men seek in marriage is happiness and that by happiness is meant the feeling of being satisfied with the married state, is to mock the whole quest for guidance by arguing in a circle.

The purely hedonistic standard of domestic achievement is valid enough as a part of a general hedonistic philosophy of life. If we judge everything under the sun by estimating its contribution to our pleasure or our pain, we are justified in weighing marriage in the same scale. The arguments for and against this general hedonistic doctrine have been the commonplaces of ethical theory since the time of the Stoics and Epicureans. It is unnecessary to discuss them here, for they have no precise bearing upon marriage as distinguished from other things in life. If we declare that the successful family is the happy family in the same sense that the successful plumber, doctor, lawyer, or admiral is the one who is happy, we have learned nothing of the special character of domestic achievement.

Sometimes this hedonistic view of marriage is offered, not

as a part of a general philosophy of pleasure, but as a special analysis of marriage alone. It is made to appear that the production of happiness is the special duty of the family. If any one is seen to be happy, let his family life receive the credit for his good fortune and if he is observed to be sad, let his family take the blame. This is, of course, an exorbitant demand to make upon marriage. If one of these dour men who rarely smile and never laugh is married, do we require that his character must change before he can be credited with success in his domestic existence? And must we regard all these merrily irresponsible people as proficient in marriage simply because of their unfailing good humor? These constant factors of character operate to make people predominantly joyful or sad, regardless of how well they are married and irrespective of whether they are married at all.

Moreover, there are always a number of independently variable external influences which operate to make people glad or unhappy. Can we demand of marriage that it counteract the effects of toothache or bankruptcy? When affliction comes from an outside source, it may be more painful to a good husband or wife than to a bad one. A man may feel a failure more poignantly because he sees that it affects his family. A personal attachment always involves the risk that we may have to share sympathetically in pain which would not touch us otherwise. A family is a hostage given to Fortune, which makes us more sensitive than we would otherwise be to the buffetings of an unkind world. How unfair, therefore, to require of marriage that it guarantee happiness to us. The hedonistic classification is misleading. Keyserling does well to warn us that marriage may be an essentially tragic situation. However desirable a happy marriage may be, we cannot accept the distinction between happy and unhappy marriages as the most significant one for those who wish to see clearly into the nature of marriage.

The purely economic distinction between richer and poorer families is a crude variant of the hedonistic classification. When people say of a girl that she is happily married, they often mean nothing more than that she is married to a man who is supporting her in comfort, and when they say of a marriage that it did not turn out well, they often mean simply that the family cannot pay its grocery bills. Inasmuch as a certain minimum of economic success is always necessary in order to lift human life above the brute level, there is a material pre-condition to the functioning of the family. This fact must be taken seriously into account by young lovers, however impatient they may be of material obstacles to their desires. But once the subsistence level is reached, any further variation in the prosperity of the family has only a superficial relation to true domestic excellence. Dr. Hamilton, in his research on marriage, reached the conclusion that discontented wives or husbands who complain of money troubles in the home are usually making use of the money trouble as a peg upon which to hang some resentment which results from a deeper cause, and that there is no significant correlation between financial success and marriage satisfaction.

If neither the biological principle nor the principle of conformity to convention nor the hedonistic principle adequately defines the functioning or measures the success of the natural family, where is a more adequate criterion to be found? Such a criterion is actually implicit in the definition of marriage and family, and needs only to be deduced from premises already established.

Marriage, it will be recalled, is a sex relationship considered in its aspect of duration. The time element enters into marriage as an essential part thereof, whereas children are only a contingent consequence. The roughest and simplest test of a good marriage is actually the endurance test.

The first function of a marriage is to last. If the purposes of those who marry do not include the intention that the relationship is to persist through a period of time, there is actually no marriage at all.

Applying this test roughly to the marriages that we know, we ask of them: Do they last? If the marriage ends in a divorce court, we consider it a failure. Whenever other things are equal, the success of a marriage is directly proportioned to its permanence. A period of time is necessary in order that the family may gain an individual character and develop a distinctive organization by the successive laying down of new strata of habit. The qualities which are legitimately sought in domestic life are time-given qualities. The ideals and purposes which are proper to marriage are those which permit of permanence. True enough, people do not all live at the same tempo; it is possible that some marriages which last only a few years may be productive of more positive domestic achievement than others which last till death. But aside from differences in the rate of living, the social convention or individual purpose which limits the duration of a marriage limits also its excellence.

For instance, there are the conventional ideas of the Moors of the Sahara, according to which frequently divorce is required. It is considered a disgrace to remain long married to the same person. One who has failed to divorce his wife after a reasonable time conceals the fact as the young American in a small town conceals the evidence of an illicit love affair. And again, there is a famous beauty whose merest flirtation is followed eagerly by the international press. Every two or three years she divorces one husband and marries another. It is hardly credible that this woman's ideals of marriage are such that she enters upon every one of these marriages with an identical aspiration toward permanence, and that two or three years suffice in each

case to disillusion her anew. Much more probably her ideal and purpose is such that marriage is to her a thing that burns itself out quickly. In so far as the time factors is concerned, the social convention of the Moors and the personal attitude of the actress are definitely inferior to conventions and ideals which seek permanence. This judgment is based upon an absolute and universal quality of marriage.

The time element, however, is not the only factor in absolute domestic excellence. There is at least one other aim which family life should attain. This additional aim is deduced from the personal character of the family relationship, just as the permanence aim is deduced from the temporal quality of marriage.

Given the natural family, what is the necessarily characteristic activity or interrelation of parts to which we can give the name of function, and by which we can measure success?

Because the family consists of determinate members, the interrelation of its parts follows the laws of a personal relationship. This would be impossible if the family membership were substitutive.

Since the characteristic behavior of the family follows the laws of personal relationship, it is free, that is to say, it arises within total, unitary personalities and is not imposed by external circumstances.

Arising within a total personality this behavior is necessarily motivated, for it is in motivated behavior that the personality operates as a principal cause.

The quality of the motive in this behavior is also determined by the laws of personal relationship. It necessarily envisages another member of the family as an end-in-himself, a complete object of value and loyalty.

Thus benevolent activity, arising from a sentiment of paramount loyalty, is the characteristic activity of the family

members. The success of a family can be judged by the degree in which it manifests this characteristic mode of conduct.

These deductions are, of course, implicit in the whole system of definitions thus far presented and discussed. The domestic man naturally appears as the ideal of conduct within the family. The success of a family is to be measured by the degree to which the members approximate in their conduct the behavior of the domestic man.

This is, after all, neither more nor less than that "affectional" function which, according to Professor Ogburn, is the one service the family continues to perform for the young people of the Occident. Let us imagine a family in which no members have the domestic attitude, and each acts solely for himself. If there is any exchange of services between family members the exchange takes place on a strictly measured basis of barter and price. No one allows the interests of any other member to enter into his personal calculations. Judged by external signs, this family is normal. The neighbors report no scandal, a biologist observing the family notes the presence of children to whom, as the sociologist would testify, the social heritage is being regularly transmitted. An economist may contribute the information that the family pays its bills, and a wandering novelist may search in vain in this home for the sense of tragic unhappiness. But domestic theory is not satisfied. In the eyes of domestic theory, this family does not fulfill its functions. It may suffice as a breeding establishment, a school, or a hotel, but as a family it leaves the important things undone.

The normal young men and women of our day think first of affection when they think of marriage. Children come later; the economic argument is usually against marriage rather than in favor of it. Marriages are launched in affection with the purpose that the affection shall last. This

function (described by lovers in an infinite number of ways) is for us the true function of the family.

In setting the purpose and estimating the success of a marriage two principal factors are therefore to be computed. On the one hand the intensity of domestic interaction; on the other hand the duration of the marriage. These are two independent variables. A marriage might last long with a minimum of domestic interaction, or it might be quickly terminated, although it had been during its brief existence a field for the intensive play of benevolent activity and appreciation. The best marriage is that which is at once most permanent and most highly charged with domestic interaction.

AN ANSWER TO THE CRITICS OF COMPANIONATE MARRIAGE *

BENJAMIN B. LINDSEY

Benjamin B. Lindsey came into national prominence as head of the Juvenile Court of Denver, Colorado, to which he was appointed in the year 1900 and elected 1901, serving until July 1, 1927. During those years and out of his practical observations, there grew a conviction that something was radically wrong with marriage, and out of that conviction developed his remedy, "Companionate Marriage." The following chapter is the second preface to the last edition of that work.

He is the author of Colorado Court Laws, which puts boys on their honor. He succeeded in having the first contributory delinquency law against adults passed by the Colorado Legislature, holding negligent parents, employers, etc., accountable. He was a candidate for governor of Colorado in 1906 and a member of the Progressive National Committee in 1912.

He is the author of *Problems of Children; The Beast and the Jungle; The Rule of Plutocracy in Colorado; The Doughboy's Religion; Pan Germanism in America; The Revolt of the Modern Youth; The House of Human Welfare; The Companionate Marriage.*

HERE I will set down briefly my definition of The Companionate Marriage. It is not putting it too strongly to say that the expression has become a living and, I believe, a permanent part of the language. If I had wanted further proof of this, after reading many press clippings on the subject, I got it recently in the form of a letter from the editors of a rather well known dictionary, asking me to help them formulate a definition. They were trying to define it, and they were having hard sledding, judging by the definition they submitted to me. So I went at it myself, and I had hard sled-

* Copyright, 1928, The Outlook Co., and 1929 by Ben B. Lindsey, and reprinted in this volume with their consent.

ding too. Crowding a program as big as The Companionate Marriage into the space usually allotted to a dictionary definition is a mental exercise which I can recommend to any cross-word puzzle fan who is looking for something to do with his spare time.

The Companionate Marriage has already been defined, in the original preface of this book as "legal marriage with legalized birth control, and with the right to divorce by mutual consent for childless couples, usually without payment of alimony." If the reader will study that and remember that my program is not anything that is not contained in that definition and set forth in the chapters of this book, he can form his own conclusions.

Here is a somewhat more extended and explicit version of that first definition:

The Companionate Marriage is a program which proposes to legalize, stabilize, and direct certain of the customs, privileges, and practices of modern marriage; practices which are already in widespread use, but which have no legal status or direction.

The first of these is birth control.

The second is divorce by mutual consent for persons who, having no dependent children, cannot remain married by mutual consent; such divorce to be granted only after a court of domestic relations had failed in a humane and scientific effort to reconcile the couple. (This would be done through what I have called a House of Human Welfare. It would consist of experts such as psychiatrists and specialists, largely supplanting the present divorce courts. This would not be easy divorce. It would be honest, scientific divorce.)

The third concerns alimony and support. It would not be the arbitrary legal right of the wife, as at present in so many states, but would be allowed when, in the judgment of the court, circumstances justified it. By the same token the prop-

erty rights of childless couples would be equitably determined with reference to the economic status of the parties and all the facts in each case.

The fourth feature of the program would be for the state to undertake the education of youth and married couples in the art of love, the laws of sex and life, to equip them better for the serious duties of marriage and parenthood. Marriage is an art and as such it should be taught in the schools.

All of these four points in this constructive program are discussed at length in this book and emphasized in my other writings and lectures on The Companionate Marriage.

Other aspects of marriage are discussed in this book, such as those with reference to the State imposing conditions to marriage as regards health and the physical capacity and ability of people to become parents. But they are no part of the constructive program of The Companionate Marriage. They could only be seriously considered in case that program is legalized and scientifically established.

Many chapters of the book deal with certain speculations and experiences with marriage, suggested by my work in a domestic relations court. But these also have little or nothing to do with the program of The Companionate Marriage.

The point I wish chiefly to emphasize about this definition of the program of The Companionate Marriage is that when I speak of "Divorce by mutual consent" I do not mean divorce given informally and easily, for the mere asking; but rather divorce given after the due inquiry I have proposed has demonstrated that the couple really want it, and don't just think they want it. "Mutual consent" is, I admit, a rather inadequate term for what I mean. It is misunderstood, and the general impression that it means divorce obtained for the asking, as people obtain a marriage license, is what has led to much of the furor over Companionate Marriage. Let me emphasize, therefore, that what I have in mind is a

special kind of court for dealing with divorce and domestic relations problems. I call it a House of Human Welfare. It would be an institute of human relations more like a doctor's office than a court. A lawyer, as a judge, would be required by present laws and constitutions of the state but with him would be added scientific experts and specialists in human conduct and behavior, especially in matters that relate to the sex side of life. It would be open and freely accessible to all classes of discordant couples. Its proceedings would be confidential. I firmly believe that it would succeed in getting at least one-third of them to change their minds instead of their mates (as they are now doing under the present free and easy method of divorce by mutual consent going on in the courts). This institution of human relations would educate and specialize in the art of marriage. It would do away with lawyers and the attendant expenses in the great majority of cases. With such aid this new kind of a court would be conducted very much as I conducted my work in Denver; and it would grant only honest divorce after it had satisfied itself that divorce was mutually desired, or was the least of the available evils. This would be indicated where, with the aid of these experts, and generally without the intervention of lawyers, it was not possible to reconcile the couple. It would, of course, be much more chary of allowing divorce when there were children than in the case of childless couples; and the very best protection would be given to wives who were the mothers of children. This care would be far superior to anything now known in any of the courts.

Unquestionably many cases would come up where one party wished the divorce and the other did not. Obviously the term "Mutual Consent" would be a misnomer when applied to divorces allowed in such cases. No rule can be laid down for such unfortunate situations. The court, or House of Human Welfare, would have to decide cases on their

merits, and on the general assumption that to hold an individual to a marriage in which he or she was an unwilling partner would on the face of it be parallel to forcing a man or woman into an undesired marriage. Special circumstances of each particular case of this character would, of course, enter into or govern the decisions of such a court of human relations, but other things being equal, I should incline to the opinion that divorce would be the only feasible solution for many such tragedies.

Let me also warn the reader against the mistaken notion that I propose "two kinds of marriage." I did inadvertently make use of that phrase, but in the same sentence, qualified it by saying that it meant "two stages in marriage." Of course, it would be the same marriage that at its different stages might present different conditions. At one time a marriage may be "Companionate," at another time the same marriage may be "Procreative"—or the "Family." But at all times while presenting different angles or stages in marriage it would be the same marriage.

Nor have I anywhere indicated that under this program a couple should agree to live together for a stated number of years and then decide whether to make the marriage "permanent." Companionate Marriage is not a marriage which would remain "sterile by contract" as one of my critics has described it; nor does it provide that the husband and wife would both work, nor that they would remain economically independent of each other. It merely provides conditions under which they could both work if they chose, and under which they could have their children when they were ready for them and not before they were ready for them. I have in no way, directly or indirectly, suggested that persons entering such a marriage should do so with the intention of remaining childless. I heartily believe in people having as many children as in their judgment they want and can prop-

erly care for. (My experience is that the great majority of "Companionate" marriages end in the "Procreative." That is the same marriage changes from the "companionate" to the "procreative" or "Family.")

All such matters would be determined, as ordinary marriage, by the individual couples, according to their own wish and good judgment without any ecclesiastical or legal interference. Under our present system they have not that liberty. Legalized Companionate marriage would merely give them the legal right to order their marriage and family life without interference. We already have people doing that illegally by means of bootleg expedients; that is to say, we already have Companionate Marriage in modern church marriage with its illegal and bootleg customs.

I am only asking for a freedom of choice for a free people in such matters, and, in the exercise of that choice, an unhampered access to the most scientific information, aid and help that the State can give.

One popular indoor sport among my critics is to refer to "Companionate Marriage" as "an untried theory," which could result only in disaster if society should sanction and legalize it.

My answer is that Norway has had the equivalent of legal Companionate Marriage since 1910, and Denmark and Sweden since 1918; and no disasters have followed. In fact the divorce rate of these three countries is much lower than ours.

These Scandinavian countries have substituted sociology for ecclesiasticism by means of a marriage and divorce code which provides that divorce may be obtained either by suit in court on the old traditional grounds, such as adultery, desertion, cruelty and the like, or by mutual agreement between the parties. If the couple want a divorce by mutual consent they first seek counsel from a minister or a duly authorized public official. (This resembles in a measure the

House of Human Welfare I have proposed.) If their differences cannot be reconciled arrangements are made as to the custody of children, division of property, alimony, etc., and they are given a decree of legal separation for a year. At the end of that cooling off period, if they again petition for a divorce, and can show that they have remained apart, they are given a final decree forthwith. In Denmark the period is a year and a half.

Does this result in the orgy of free and easy divorce which my critics predict? In 1926 Sweden had only .29 divorces per thousand of population; Norway had .21; Denmark had .57; the United States of America had 1.52.

They have what is practically a legalized companionate; we have the unlegalized, bootleg article. They have decency; we have puritanical hypocrisy and superstition. And the difference in these figures tells the story. In addition, these enlightened countries have no "obscenity" laws against contraception, sex education and other aids to decency and civilized living.

Before I conclude may I attempt a little more light on that word "Companionate." Sex relations in modern marriage may be classed as "Procreative" and "Companionate." The "procreative" is for the begetting of children and it was out of this relationship that the institution of the family originated. It is the only sex relationship that is known to domestic animals and it is strictly limited to their mating time for the begetting of their species. Unlike the animals, sex relationships among human beings are both "procreative" and "companionate," although there still persists an element in society that would confine all human sex relationships to the "procreative." Yet it must be generally conceded that the great majority of such relationships in all church and civil marriages are deliberately "companionate"; that is they exist for the resultant spiritual, physical, and healthful satisfac-

tions of sex between lovers in lawful marriage—not that there will never be any children, but only desired children. Notwithstanding this universal practice of the "companionate" sex relationship by modern married couples in all of the churches that relationship is still under the ban of the most ancient and powerful among them. They condemn the "companionate" relationship as sinful and lustful. This is on the theory that sex is sin unless such relations are, in lawful marriage, confined to the begetting of children; or, what amounts to substantially the same thing, that no artificial means shall be employed to guarantee the "companionate" sex relationship against the "procreative." The State unites with this powerful element of the Church to enforce that ancient code. This is done by the laws popularly known as the "laws against Birth Control." To these laws are added others, making it dangerous, or as difficult as possible, to get the truth about the most important relations of human beings. All of this frantic and, I believe, illegal union of Church and State against the truth about sex seems to be on the theory that people can be kept "good," only by keeping them ignorant. It is a shining example of that woeful lack of faith in the restraining and refining influences of culture, good taste, real education and religion.

In this book I make two distinct and different uses of the word "companionate." Since this has resulted in some confusion in the minds of readers I want to emphasize the distinction here. What I mean by "The Companionate Marriage" is the four-point marriage code here described. What I mean by the "Companionate" in marriage is a non-procreative sex relationship in marriage. All the essential elements in "The Companionate Marriage" program are in general practice. No power of Church or State is going to stop these practices. The question is not shall we stop them, because that is impossible. The question is shall we continue them

as bootleg and illegal, dishonest and unscientific, with the devastating effects due to that illegality, or shall we legalize and scientifically direct them with the very reliable certainty that we shall thereby avoid many of the difficulties and dangers to which marriage is now subject.

We should be as much concerned over the causes of the failure of people to get married as over the causes of the failure of so many to stay married. According to the last Federal census there are approximately ten million young men in this country between the ages of twenty and thirty years and not over four million or forty per cent of them are married at all. The codes of Church and State forbid them any normal or natural sex relations except in lawful marriage. Out of wedlock they are commanded to chastity and continence. In this age of great sex temptations and opportunities, how many of them remain continent? Surely it is not a satisfactory situation either from the standpoint of morals, or of mental and physical health. I would rather that marriage be legally liberalized to encourage more of them to get married even if a large per cent of them got divorces. We would thereby improve morality, and encourage families of healthy children as was done in Holland, when some twenty years ago they legalized the "companionate" sex relationship by permitting contraceptive information. In this country we seem to prefer dishonesty, hypocrisy, immorality and crime by insisting upon coercive laws that most of our intelligent people simply refuse to obey. This is not the fault of the people but of those reactionary elements in society who do not believe in people, who do not trust them, who have no faith in either culture or education, but insist upon absurd laws to make people "good." In conventional morals I want more left to the people and less to the laws.

I have also already made it clear in this book that the word "Companionate" has been used by sociologists before

I used it. I there referred to its use in the *Journal of Social Hygiene* where I believe the word was first used in connection with marriage in an article by Prof. M. M. Knight of Barnard College, in that *Journal* for May, 1924.

Here is a passage from Dr. Knight's article:

> For the purpose of this brief discussion, we may call the state of lawful wedlock, entered into solely for companionship, and not contributing children to society, the "companionate," using the term "family" in its true historical sense, as the institution for regulating reproduction, early education, property inheritance, and some other things. These limitations are observed in order to make it clear that an actual and general condition is being dealt with, not a vague theory of what may be or ought to be. The companionate is one of our commonest institutions. We have been dealing with it as though it were a family, which it is not.

The constructive program which I propose in this book, and in my lectures and pamphlets, under the label or title of "The Companionate Marriage," is not identical with Dr. Knight's conception. It includes it, but it takes a much broader form in the four-point social program, which, as I have pointed out, provides (1) legalized birth control, (2) divorce by mutual consent through a special court of human relations that I have called a House of Human Welfare, (3) special provisions with regard to alimony, and (4) adequate educational preparation for love, marriage and parenthood. The "Companionate" marriage I have in mind would not be entered into as Dr. Knight suggested, "solely for companionship," though it could be entered into for companionship alone if the persons concerned, for reasons satisfactory to themselves, decided never to have children.

And finally, let me remind the reader, that modern mar-

riage is no longer to be either fixed or judged by its ceremony. Once that was the situation when ecclesiastical authority backed by the State, was, practically in entire control of the institution of marriage. The Church made marriage a sacrament. The ceremony actually made the marriage "until death do us part." It was quite immaterial whether either or both of the parties to the marriage should ever after desire a different arrangement. There could be no divorce in this life. The Church contended that this was "the law of God." But if it ever was the "law of God" it has now been repealed by practically all of the states. With the exception of one or two states divorce is now permitted on other grounds than adultery. Thus it is that in modern marriage the ceremony is regarded merely as evidence of the marriage. The marriage is to be judged by its practices and customs. The customs of marriage are determined by what the majority do. Since no one in his right senses seriously disputes that the great majority of married couples indulge in a sex relationship which definitely and intentionally avoids the begetting of more than a chosen number of children, or if they so desire, none at all, it must be conceded that, as judged by its customs, modern marriage is companionate marriage. Birth control, collusive easy mutual consent divorce, the pathetic struggle for forbidden sex education—we have them all as a part of our marriage customs, even though bootleg and illegal—forbidden by State and Federal laws.

The fact that these important customs are illegal assures their continuance without scientific or honest social direction. All of this illegality, ignorance, superstition and hypocrisy is devastating to the institution of marriage. It is bound to make it unstable. It is largely responsible for the failures in marriage, the mounting increase in unnecessary divorce, and the growing number of voluntary relationships of the sexes outside of any legal status whatever. When the neces-

sary features and customs of modern marriage pointed out in the program of "The Companionate Marriage" are legalized and brought under proper social control, we shall then have added materially to the happiness and permanence of marriage and the stability of the home.

THE DOCTOR LOOKS AT COMPANIONATE MARRIAGE *

JOSEPH COLLINS

To men of science Joseph Collins, M.D., is known as the founder of the Neurological Institute, and as the great specialist in nervous diseases. To his patients and his friends he is known as the genial adviser, firm when need be, always kindly. To the public he is the doctor who has looked at love and life, at doctors, at literature, at biography—the man who has taken the literary pulse.

Dr. Collins is a physician by training, an idealist by nature. He is now in his sixtieth year, having been born in Brookfield, Connecticut, 1867. He graduated in medicine at the University of the City of New York in 1888, but soon realizing that the successful practice of his profession required far more knowledge than he possessed, he abandoned the pursuit of it and went to Germany to study.

Experience gained in private practice and in the New York City Hospital which he served as Attendant Physician soon convinced him that there was no variety of disease of which physicians were so colossally and so wilfully ignorant as nervous diseases, and he determined to do what he could to remedy the former and to overcome the latter. When he was forty years of age he withdrew from the active practice of medicine and devoted all his time and energy to the establishment of the Neurological Institute of New York, the purpose of which was the study, interpretation and treatment of nervous and mental disorder. At the end of ten years, the Neurological Institute was a going concern.

During the War, Dr. Collins first did duty in this country at Officers' Training Camps, but was soon transferred to the American Red Cross in Italy as Medical Director of that organization. His experiences in Italy provided him with the material for the volumes which first brought his name before the public in connection with literature. They were entitled *My Italian Year* and *Idling in Italy;* the first concerned largely with the Italian people and the remarkable gesture that they were making, the latter with Italian literature, particularly modern literature. After his two years' absence to Italy, he returned to this country and took up con-

---

* Published in the December 21, 1927, issue of *The Outlook,* and reprinted in this symposium with their generous consent and that of the author.

sulting practice which enabled him to devote much of his time to literature. A series of volumes were published entitled: *The Doctor Looks at Literature; Taking the Literary Pulse; The Doctor Looks at Biography; The Doctor Looks at Love and Life;* and many magazine articles which attracted widespread attention, particularly those: "Woodrow Wilson, Psychologically," "Mussolini and the Fascisti"—both of which appeared in the *North American Review;* "Childish Americans" and "A Doctor Looks at Doctors," in *Harper's Magazine;* "A Study in Self-Glorification" in the *Bookman,* and an estimate of the last Emperor of Germany in the New York *Times.* The following chapter appeared for the first time in the December 21, 1927, *Outlook,* and is a critical answer to Companionate Marriage from one of the leading neurologists in the country.

JOHN FARRAR.

THERE are a few truths about marriage that are universally admitted. That it is venerable, honorable, vulnerable, are some of them. Perhaps it would be no exaggeration to say that nearly every one who marries wishes, at one time or another, that he had not. This regret may be fleeting, or it may lead to the divorce court. The number of married persons who are seized with the permanent variety of dissatisfaction grows greater every year in this country. One out of every eight marriages is now dissolved by the courts. In the past fifty years the divorce rate has increased nearly three hundred and fifty per cent.

The Church of every stripe and label is alarmed; organizations devoted to man's welfare are concerned; and individuals jealous of their country's reputation are worried. Men and women who feel it a privilege and a duty to live harmoniously with the conventions and institutions that civilization, culture, and enlightenment have erected and found good see in this rapid increase of divorce the heralds of National decline. They think something must be done about it; otherwise, the foundations of our social structure will be undermined and the supporting pillars of society razed. They maintain that there are no elements of perpetuity to guarantee the preservation of a nation if moral law be violated. Divorce violates it in the vast majority of instances. About

one-half of all divorces are granted for desertion, and in the majority of them it is fraudulent and collusive.

Society is ill, desperately ill. Many doctors have been summoned and more have volunteered their service. Among the latter there is none so sure that he has a remedy, or more insistent that it be tried, than Ben B. Lindsey, one time judge in the Juvenile and Family Court of Denver. He calls it "companionate marriage," and he defines it as legal marriage, with legalized birth control and right to divorce by mutual consent for childless couples, usually without payment of alimony. The moment a companionate marriage is no longer childless it becomes a family marriage. He fears it may be thought that companionate marriage is a revised edition of trial marriage. He denies any analogy save those that trial marriage has with every kind of marriage. No one can predict with certainty the outcome of any union. Trial marriage, however, implies something which is openly tentative, provisional, and experimental. It differs little from unmarried unions save that it takes the name marriage. Its whole psychology rests on uncertainty and hesitation. In companionate marriage there is none of that. It is a legal marriage. Every childless marriage wherein by mutual agreement the parties can obtain a divorce is a companionate. He thinks that under this sort of marriage, with legalized birth control, most persons would marry, as they do now, with the firm belief that their union would be permanent.

A marriage that can be dissolved by mutual consent is at least an excellent imitation of a trial marriage. The difference between them is that some one in authority has said to the companionates, "I now pronounce you man and wife," and if anyone throws bricks at them he can be haled before the law. The judge will have difficulty in convincing even the most credulous that some, perhaps most, of those who contract this variety of marriage are not testing matrimony,

its privileges and entailments. It makes matrimony akin to trying on hats. One keeps on trying until a lid is found that fits and is becoming and comfortable. Those that have been pressed down upon the head and then discarded have not been injured in their market value; others buy them with readiness and satisfaction. It should be called "experimental marriage," for that is what it really is. Judge Lindsey maintains that companionate marriage is already an established social fact in this country and that it ought to be conventionally respectable. He means, it is to be supposed, that birth control is being practiced by some married couples until they find out whether or not they like one another well enough to go on living together, or until one of them finds some one with whom he would rather live. When they make this discovery, they frame a conspiracy, hire a lawyer, and get a divorce. He believes that this is becoming so universal among the educated that soon we shall be a nation of hypocrites, the best people evil-doers, and every mouth speaking folly.

The ignorant and the poor, he thinks, are spared the hypocrisy, for they cannot find out about birth control, and lawyers do not give their services without pay. He does not tell us how he arrived at the conclusion that the poor cannot learn how to limit families. He believes that "scientific contraception promises what may be developed into the most revolutionary change in human affairs that history has ever recorded." Judge Lindsey is entitled to an opinion and to an expression of it. But those who are inclined to accept it in this instance should keep clearly in mind that there is no such thing as scientific contraception. The whole subject is highly controversial, but no one would suspect it from reading Judge Lindsey's book. These nature thwarters would have us believe that there are methods of preventing conception which are sure and which can be utilized without injury. Nothing could be further from the truth. There is only one

sure way—abstinence. Some methods are safer than others, but there are objections to them all; some are hygienic, others are hedonistic. To discuss the former it would be necessary to be specific about the procedure; that cannot be done here. It must suffice to say that, unless applied skillfully and used with great circumspection, the method that insures the greatest safety carries with it danger of injuries to tissues whose concern is reproduction. The supreme objection to all methods is in the spiritual, not the material field, and it seems to have escaped Judge Lindsey.

Socially we have many duties, biologically we have one: to reproduce our kind. Mating is an instinctive response to a biological craving for a specific form of physical gratification upon which depends the survival of mankind. Man has survived because he has been able to appease his sex hunger, and should he survive it will be for the same reason. While responding to this biological craving, man and woman reach a degree of intimacy with nature, and reach toward God with such success that they become, for a while, akin to him in their creative capacity.

There are still many of us who believe that the children who are born of pure love are the children who radiate love and genius; regulation of their advent by consideration of time, conditions, conventions, and material propitiousness would mean the destruction of the love element, which would be replaced by worldly wisdom and economic sense.

It is a hazardous business thwarting nature; and, though she often seems to be satisfied with deferred payment, she exacts it finally in one coin or another. A militant advocate of contraception in this country says "birth control is hygienic, scientific, and harmless." I say that anything that is disharmonious with nature cannot be scientific, and that it is injurious. A lifelong contact with individuals afflicted with nervous and mental disorders should make me a more com-

petent witness than a lay woman. No one can practice any form of birth control systematically and continuously without being injured spiritually, and few without being injured bodily.

There is something in life besides health. There are truth and beauty. Contraceptives of all varieties dent them both. When the one godlike possession we have must be preceded by premeditation, accompanied by unnatural contrivance, and followed by doubts and fears, it becomes a travesty of the source of beauty.

The most trying feature of the contraceptionist is his cocksureness, and Judge Lindsey is no exception. "It would be difficult," he says, "to overstate the economic, the eugenic, the broad social significance of contraception which is even today changing marriage in some of its fundamental aspects." In truth, the subject is most complex; the benefits that it confers are highly problematical, and the methods of attempting to obtain them uncertain and not very practical.

Those who are seeking to better the conditions of life, to improve the race, and to increase the happiness of its constituents are deserving of our praise and our coöperation, but they should take care not to alienate us by statements unsupported by fact and promises which they cannot fulfill.

There is one instrument to shape the human race: enlightenment. It might be called education were not that word used synonymously with learning. When the fundamental principles of biology, physiology, psychology, and sociology are taught in the schools of this country at the expense of algebra, history, and rhetoric, race improvement and individual happiness will gain momentum.

Much as one may be inclined not to discuss contraception from the standpoint of morality, one would be strangely obtuse not to admit that information about contraceptives and their use is bound to change our practice of sex morality,

though it does not alter our theory. The sex urge in women, generally, is not so imperious as in man; probably because it has been repressed and inhibited for so many centuries. The source of the inhibition has been fear. Morality based upon fear has value for the community, but none for the individual. The reason the country is so rich in prohibition is that we are so poor in ideals. Women may have found the price excessive which they had to pay to appease the social tyrant. They may now testify without losing caste. They should be heard. If our idealization of woman as pure, modest, chaste, is founded in error, we should know it. It is lamentable that we should lose any ideal, but if this is a false one perhaps we shall be better without it.

The keystone of the bridge to happiness and efficiency that the Denver Solon would build is contraception; the buttresses are economic freedom and eugenic prosperity; the right of way is divorce.

If a man can support his wife and she is willing to be supported, well and good; if he cannot, she must provide her own living either in the sweat of her brow or from the purse of her parents. It is to be presumed that a wife may support her husband should they be of one mind in the matter.

It is universally admitted that marriage is for the masses the beginning of an economic struggle in which the husband is frequently defeated and the wife always disillusioned. If parents are willing to support their wedded children until the time comes when these children are convinced that they can live together until death parts them, parenthood has taken on greater obligation and progeny is conceded wider privilege. Those whose parents are neither rich nor generous and who wish to try companionate marriage must support themselves. That is the best feature of the project. Woman needs a few more things that she may accomplish her spiritual emancipation, but none so much as work. The

male child is brought up from infancy in the knowledge that as soon as he reaches manhood he will work; and in the majority of instances his scholastic education has in view the kind of work he will do and its aim is to prepare him for it. The girl, on the other hand, is brought up to believe that her job in life is to hook a man who will support her. She may have to work for a while that she may buy tempting bait and angle in promising waters, but such work is a means to an end. She will do it, not for pleasure or for self-expression, but that she may open the gate to the Elysian field. When she first arrives, she is convinced the pasturage is sweet and that it will last forever. She does not browse there long before it begins to taste bitter, and soon she feels spiritually undernourished. Many attempt to get out, more stay to starve.

The symptoms of this marasmus are restlessness, boredom, drink, drugs, dissatisfaction, and divorce. Every one, women most of all, should hail any measure, conventional or mandatory, which makes woman work, so long as it does not impose acceptation of the Soviet principles or undermine morality. It would be difficult to say anything new about the value of work as a soul satisfier or as a source of pleasure; but as a means of self-realization it has no equal, and as a mischief prophylactic it has few superiors.

Anything that will act as an antidote to the weakness which tempts women to rely on men for the solution of their problems, to seek guidance in every perplexity, to play safe in the sphere of belief and opinion, should be very acceptable to them.

The more opportunities that come to women to show that they are the equal of the so-called stronger sex, the better pleased they should be. Sight should not be lost, however, of the possibility that their gain will be man's loss. A man who really loves his wife wants to support her. It is a privi-

lege, a pleasure, and a pride. The pleasure of giving is keener than that of receiving, and infinitely more beneficial. Deprive man of it, and the beast may peer out; it has long been believed that wife as well as babes were an incentive to man's labor and effort; in proportion as he is deprived of it, his ambition is lessened. Chivalry has lost much of its flavor and not a little of its display, but "women and children first" is still good form on foundered ships. It will be a sad day for man when woman becomes entirely independent!

It is no new interpretation of love to look upon it as a species of madness, nor is it a new characterization to refer to it as frenzy. Marriages are planned, contracted, and consummated while the partners are mildly insane. The average duration of most curable psychoses is about eighteen months; this one lasts about two years, often longer. Companionate marriage gives the partners time to recover before they offer hostages to fortune. Its originator does not attempt to state definitely how long a couple should wait before they know they are adjustable, but they should wait until they are sure of it before they have a baby, and until they have means to support the mother, conduct the birth with safety and comfort, and bring up the child properly. Nor does it give any hint as to when the mother should return to work after childbirth. That is a very important matter.

It is a mistake to assume that women like to work or dislike to be supported. Probably nine out of ten workingwomen hail matrimony as a liberator from the bondage of work far more joyously than as a messenger with a license for new pleasures. Few, save those who have not been compelled to work and who find killing time the poorest sport in the world, view work in the right light. If shopkeepers, manufacturers, and natural resource promoters were to share their profits with those who help make them, working people would regard work under new aspects. Should the

women who try companionate marriage tell the world that self-respect is developed by self-supporting work it would help the cause.

The majority of women, not only like to be supported, they like to be protected, sheltered, and looked after generally and generously. They particularly like to have their thinking done for them. Comparatively few are lamps unto themselves, and many of those are careless to trim and keep alight their lamps. Should companionate marriage cause the light of the ideal self to burn more brightly, it would help decrease the gloom that now envelops woman's efforts at self-realization. Had Judge Lindsey deleted his recent book of some of the stories whose moral is necessity of marriage reformation, and filled the space thus obtained by pointing out how his plan would make it easier and surer for us to reach our goal—self-development, spiritual growth, happiness, usefulness—he might have made, at least, some potential converts.

Possibly parents might be induced to put before their children in their plastic years two concrete facts: their duty to God and nature is to have children; their duty to themselves and state is self-realization. They should be taught all that is known about these duties and the best way of discharging them. So long as children are brought up in crass ignorance of the fundamental principles of physical and spiritual growth, as they now are, we shall continue to be as uncertain of our marital footing. Should that ignorance be dispelled, we might confidently look for safer and better matrimony.

There is no doubt that much of matrimony's success depends upon sexual sympathy and adaptation. Companionate marriage aims to determine that before children are born. But the very means that it employs, and that it suggests should be made legal, tend to defeat that end. Its advocates may deny it, but my conviction is based upon what has been

told me by those who have essayed it. I fancy that most physicians who have had large experience will agree.

It is to be presumed that all who contemplate or contract companionate marriage hope to have and intend to have children. They should be informed that the longer they delay, the less the likelihood that they will have them. This is not the weightiest objection to this form of marriage, but it is a serious one. It will be said that many who contract the ordinary marriage postpone the advent of children. They too pay. Nature stands just so much swatting; then it swats back with sterility. A pertinent question is, How long should it take companionates to find out whether they are adjustable? Some discerning ones can find out in a few weeks, others require several years. Surely the latter should not be denied the most enduring satisfaction of life—paternity—all that time.

Another important question for Judge Lindsey to answer is why he believes companionate marriage will promote and facilitate conjugal love. Every one who has experienced and observed it knows that it is based largely upon mutual regard and common interests. The variety of marriage that he advocates does not develop mutual interests. The partners go their respective ways, have their individual interests and engrossments, and the only thing they have in common is eating and sleeping. The feature of companionate marriage that many who do not see eye to eye with the Church find most repugnant is the one that seeks to establish that the female partner is not damaged by the companionship that she has experienced. From the physician's point of view, she may or may not be. It depends. To claim that sex experience *per se* injures woman is to claim an absurdity. But the strength of tradition is measureless, and there is no better established tradition than that a woman who has sex relations beyond sacramental or civil matrimony is "damaged goods." The com-

panionate advocate will say that she has been married and that her assets as wife and mother have not been depleted by her experience. Her status is the same as that of one widowed by fate or law.

However one looks upon marriage, he must admit that it is an important discipline. If it can be dissolved for the asking, our characters are sure to suffer.

Companionate marriage has merit, but it has one tremendous demerit. By separating sex relations and parenthood it razes the strongest pillar of matrimony. Many a man puts up with a wife who has borne him children and many a woman tolerates her spouse because he has been the means by which she has fulfilled her physiological destiny and permitted her the kind of love that surpasses all others.

One has to adjust one's self to life after middle age as well as before. Children are the medium that accomplishes it. The parental urge can be substituted only in youth. Delays are proverbially dangerous; never more so than in parenthood. Youth is selfish. When age brings altruism, it is oftentimes accompanied by incapacity.

Parenthood is the most important business of life and self-realization the most imperative duty. Birth control fetters the former, but it may facilitate the latter by putting idealism, upon which all serious-minded thinking men and women believe the future of the race depends, upon a higher level. Women have to be good for the sake of being good; men, that women may consent to bear them children.

There is not the smallest likelihood that companionate marriage will become "good form." The tyrant custom or convention rules with great ease in this country. Our National infirmity is spiritual indolence. We have profound aversion to change and the devil's alleged hatred of holy water is mild compared to our hatred of heresy. We have rules of conduct and are determined that our fellows shall

hold fast to them. We have standards of morality to which they must conform, otherwise they will be visited by our special variety of dervish, who will punish them in his own special way. We are avid of praise and intolerant of criticism, and there is one thing we cannot stand—growing pains of the soul.

As a nation we are not "psychic." This country is not a good place to start anything, particularly anything in the line of reformation. We emptied our reform reservoir in the early 'sixties of the last century, and we have not been able to refill it. We are hopeful that it can be accomplished, but Judge Lindsey does not encourage us much.

MONOGAMIC MARRIAGE AS A SOLUTION OF HUMAN MATING *

THOMAS WALTON GALLOWAY

The death of Thomas Walton Galloway in July, 1929, removed from America one of her most distinguished scholars in the field of Biology and Social Sciences.

Dr. Galloway was born in Columbia, Tennessee, November 2, 1866. He graduated from Cumberland University in 1887, receiving his M.A. degree in 1889 and his doctorate in 1892. He was Professor in Natural History in Baird College, Clinton, Missouri, 1887-1889. Did post-graduate work at Harvard University, 1889-1891, winning the Bowdoin prize.

He was formerly Professor of Biology and Dean of the Missouri Valley College. From 1902 to 1915 he was Professor of Biology at the James Millikin University, Decatur, Illinois. From 1915 to 1919 he was Professor of Zoology at Beloit College. He was Associate Director of the Department of Education, and a member of the American Social Hygiene Association.

His volume *Love and Marriage*, from which the following chapter has been reprinted, is one of the National Health Series edited by the National Health Council and was published in 1924.

Among his other works are the following: *First Course in Zoology; Elementary Zoology; The Religion of an Evolutionist; Biology of Sex for Parents and Teachers; Reproduction; Motivation in Moral Education; Sex and Life; Sex Factor in Human Life; The Father and His Boy; The Dynamic Instinct in Religious Education; Sex and Social Health; Love and Marriage; Parenthood and the Character Education of Children;* etc.

ALL the forms of sex-relationships that we find among men and animals have grown out of efforts, partly instinctive and partly conscious, to solve the problems that grow

* This chapter is taken from Thomas W. Galloway's *Love and Marriage*, published by Funk & Wagnalls Company, New York and London, 1924, and reprinted with their permission and that of the National Health Council.

out of the joint functions of sex and of the reproduction and care of young, and out of the powerful impulses connected with them. These two functions, sex and reproduction, have always been closely connected since sex first appeared on the earth. Their impulses interweave intimately in all the higher animals. In trying consciously to find out human solutions for both sex and reproduction we cannot hope for success in either unless we hold the values of both firmly, and hold them together. This is to say that no solution of sex relations at the conscious level of human beings can possibly be sound which ignores reproduction and all the social problems connected therewith; and equally that no program of reproduction can be socially acceptable which fails to make the best use, for the sake of the offspring, of the powerful bonds and inspirations of sex and the love and happiness of parents.

We cannot take monogamy for granted. Many people feel that monogamic marriage must be taken without question as the final and only thinkable solution of this joint problem of human sex and reproduction. For various reasons the author believes monogamic family life to be for us the most logical and practically wholesome, as well as the most successful, sex-reproductive arrangement yet developed in nature or conceived by human beings. Nevertheless, he believes that we must, from the point of view of the further perfection of life, continually reckon with the fact that our whole civilization is experimental and cannot be thought of as final at any point. If this is true we must be open-minded to the possibility of improving both the standards and the methods of our governments, our industrial system, and our social institutions.

To be sure, such efforts at improvement should be in the hands of those who really seek social progress and betterment; not in the hands of those who would destroy institutions merely because they are old or because they become irk-

some to the individual and interfere with his personal desires. Since, however, each new generation should, even if we are right, be brought to accept monogamy in theory and practice because of positive and satisfying conviction and not merely from the force of convention, we need both to perfect our monogamy and to demonstrate for every generation its values as compared with those of proposed or possible substitutes. In no other way can we put any of our social institutions upon a rational, scientific, and progressive, rather than a sentimental and traditional, basis.

On the other hand, progress does not demand in each generation that we repeat universally all the race-wide experiments which have been tried and discarded in the long ages of human trial and error.

Past Experiments in Sex Relations

In trying to find truth now we cannot afford to ignore past experience and its results. This brief book will not allow any full discussion of the age-long sex-experiments of animals and men. In general, however, we may say that both animals and men have tried every possible type of relation between the sexes. As suggested in our study of courtship, various species of higher animals show: (1) Complete promiscuity depending upon chance and the impulses of the moment; (2) promiscuity limited to certain groups of males and females; (3) all degrees of elimination of males serving groups of females down to a completely polygamous condition in which one male has succeeded in driving away all competitors; (4) temporary monogamy during at least one reproductive season; and (5) permanent monogamy until the death of one of the pair.

The best information we have about the higher mammals nearest in their general characteristics to man, is that they either run in monogamous pairs living somewhat to them-

selves or live in troops in which any tendency to such pairing is modified more or less by polygamous or random relations.

All these methods have shown themselves able to meet the actual needs of the species adopting them both as satisfying their sex impulses and for propagating the species. In general we may fairly say, however, that animals, as they have gained in complexity of instincts and in social life, give more attention to their young and hence do not need to produce so many young. Where the young are given considerable care the tendency is for the father to take part in this and the sex relations trend toward either polygamy or monogamy of some duration as a solution of the essential needs of sex and reproduction combined.

Additional Elements in Human Experiments

In our discussion of human courtship attention was called to the ways in which our enlarging powers of memory, imagination, and reflection enrich and intensify sex impulses and courtship. Extending the time and opportunities for intercourse between mates by removing the special limited seasons of heat, coupled with the growing personal understandings and appreciations between the sexes would increase the trend toward constancy in love and pairing; but would at the same time increase sensitiveness to the attractions of others than the mate and thus open the way for unfaithfulness. We saw that jealousy tends in some degree to check these relations outside the pair. The result of these and many other factors seems to have been, so far as our knowledge of human history throws light on the subject, to open up the field again for wide sex experimentation on the more conscious level. Even though man probably appeared on the earth with essentially monogamous instincts, he has grafted upon these his new powers and freedom and has repeated for himself all the animal experiments of promiscuity, of polygamy, of

polyandry, of monogamy, with all sorts of variations and compromises.

Outstanding Trends

In spite of the probability that man was prevailingly monogamous originally, we cannot fairly say that the human race, taken as a whole, has come to any single conclusion about its sex-reproductive experiments, unless it be against the two extremes of celibacy and bald, unmodified promiscuity. We have at the present moment practically all the possible forms of sex-parental relations in actual approved practice by mankind in different parts of the earth. This variety is very likely due to the force of tradition and custom among the tribes of men and to isolation from each other while the experiment was in the making. In other words each group has made and has been made by its own initial line of experiment, and at most only a few main groups have been enough aware of what others were doing to compare the experiments. Possibly by this time none of us is open-minded enough to conceive without prejudice the experiments alien to our own.

Notwithstanding all this it seems within the truth to say that human experiments have led, as animal experiments did before them, toward two main solutions; polygamy and monogamy. Historically there seems to have been considerable shifting, among human beings from one of these to the other. Sexually monogamy may displace polygamy as a refinement of it; conversely polygamy may arise from monogamy as an effort to conventionalize extramarital relations.

Clearly many other factors beside the sexual have had part in determining whether monogamy or polygamy prevails at a given time and place. These include, among others, economic and industrial conditions, transmission of property, the idea of woman as property or as inferior, autocratic as

against democratic conceptions of social relations, isolation, and religion. We must never forget, however, that these influences are incidental and do not originate the fundamental sex-parental relations. These latter are much older and more basic than any of the modifying factors mentioned.

It may fairly be said, then, in summarizing, that the history of both animals and men points to these conclusions: (1) that the conditions of life have led to the freest possible experiments in sex-productive relations; (2) that there is essential agreement in the trends among the higher animals on a largely instinctive plane, and in man who has been guided by somewhat more of consciousness and reason; and (3) that the trends in both have been toward permanent as against temporary relations of the mates and toward monogamous as against promiscuous or polygamous unions. This latter statement is true at least of those human groups and civilizations which have given most reflection to the meaning of their social experiments and to the possibility of social betterment, and which have shown themselves most conscious of universal human personal worth—including that of women and children, in a word of those which have had the most democratic evolution and whose "fitness" has consisted in accepting the sex-reproductive function as essentially social and sacrificing rather than as merely pleasure-giving and personal.

These conclusions, even if correct, do not necessarily mean that we have reached final perfection in sex-reproductive relations. But these refinements of sex method have shown themselves to be of practical value in the survival of the species. They have accompanied and been perfected along with the enlargement and enrichment of human civilization, and have themselves added greatly to that enrichment. They are selective therefore in human history. They are based on actualities and discrimination and not upon prejudiced

opinion merely. The burden of proof is heavy upon any who would radically remold the order of progress, or even open up again the whole course of sex experimentation.

The Monogamic Ideal

If we accept the seeming truth that evolution among animals and the more conscious development among men have alike led toward permanent union of one male and one female on the basis of coöperative equality and the joint care and responsibility for offspring, and have stamped this as rather the fittest device for mating and reproduction, it remains to examine some of the facts that are implied in this sort of mating. What ideals and what standards of behavior belong essentially to this particular mode of relationship if it is to reach success among human beings, who can feel and remember, can know and plan and purpose? We may sum these up without any extended argument:

1. It demands a beginning warmth of mutual emotional devotion sufficient to induce an effort at permanent adjustment.
2. It demands confidence of each in the other as giving himself whole-heartedly to the union, as shown not merely in sex enthusiasm but also in the sharing of responsibility, service, and sacrifice.
3. Such confidence demands actual sex faithfulness on the part of each to the other, a living by each up to the feelings of exclusive possession felt by the other. Such confidence does not come out of indifference of each to the sex acts of the other.
4. It demands equality, mutuality, and democracy between individuals as persons and between the sexes, in standards, in privileges, and in responsibilities. The natural differences between the sexes call for some

division of functions, but not for inequality and autocracy.

5. Because our powers of memory and reflection, imagination and anticipation unite our whole consciousness into a continuous and consistent unit, true monogamy among us increasingly demands that both individuals shall be faithful to the others in the ideal of and practice for monogamy before marriage as well as during marriage.

Reduced to a sentence, then, monogamous marriage, to be worthy of the name, implies a single standard of abstinence from sex intercourse before marriage and of a faithfulness and mutual consideration during marriage, all in the interest of complete confidence and equal participation in the privileges and happiness, the pains and responsibilities of mating and home-making.

It is necessary to remember that the human race is not old, as races go, and is in process of refixation in respect to this monogamic standard and practice on a conscious basis. It is accepted fully in practice by many men and women; by more as an ideal. But many who accept monogamy as a general standard do not accept all the elements necessary to make it succeed. It remains to be seen whether we human beings, now that we are coming into a fuller, more discriminating consciousness and mastery of life's factors, are rationally willing to pay the price for a perfect monogamy.

Conflict of Selfish and Social Motives in Mating

In spite of the fact that sex and reproduction are so intimately joined in man and that the primary work of sex is to make a surer and better reproduction, there is a far-reaching difference between the feelings and emotions and impulses of sex and those of reproduction. We have already

emphasized the fact that reproduction involves automatically tasks and responsibilities and pains which are chiefly unselfish and social and sacrificing in their nature. Sex, on the contrary, although leading to these unselfish functions, is surcharged with impulses and satisfactions which are in themselves most keenly selfish and personal. It is as though a group of self-gratifying desires and satisfactions had been added to the social sacrifices and pains of reproduction as inducements and rewards for sound performance. Human mating, therefore, may fairly be said to have two goals: (1) the production of new individuals and the perpetuation and improvement of the species; and (2) the satisfaction and happiness of the mates, including the keen selfish gratification of sex relations. This is in the order of their biological importance; but because the impulses and pleasures connected with the latter are more in the focus of individual consciousness we tend to put them in first place. In other words while there are both individual and social elements in each of these joined functions, the individual elements predominate in parenthood and home-making.

If we carry our analysis one step further we find that the personal relations of the sexes, apart from parenthood, involve (1) the more selfish and immediate satisfactions of intercourse, and (2) the more permanent and social and coöperating tasks of companionship, adjustment, and mutual development of the mates. Now it is inevitable that the highly selfish pleasures of sex indulgence should stand out more or less in individual consciousness against the mixed pains and pleasures of friendly coöperation and parenthood. The untrained individual is organically more interested in sex intercourse; even apart from parenthood, society is much more interested in the successful adjustments of the mates than in the physical relations.

These impulses and tasks are not incompatible unless we

selfishly seek to gain the pleasure without accepting the responsibilities. This is just the end that a large section of humanity is using its wits trying to do; to put individual desire and the personal liberty to gratify desires ahead of social and racial welfare and usefulness.

How May This Conflict Be Composed

The conflict between personal liberty and social welfare, as welfare is conceived by the best or even by the majority, is as old as progress. It is not confined to the problems of sex and reproduction, although it is peculiarly strong here. The conflict between these ideals may take place between the individual himself as his various desires, higher or lower, compete for his attention. The conflict is seen anew every time our increasing knowledge and rational discrimination undertake to support greater social coöperation. It was seen when men began, whether by instinct or intelligence, to give up promiscuity for the closer social relations and restraints of the harem or the family. It has been seen in every step of advance by which we have given up personal, family, tribal, or class rights of indulgence and competition in the interest of larger groups. It is seen now whenever in business there is any effort to control class privilege for the sake of justice; or among nations international or racial coöperation tends to displace national partnership, initiative, and competition. No social progress has ever been made except by giving up selfish personal privilege and the competition for privilege.

All progress in this means that nature long ago put its stamp of approval upon the social group and the social spirit, as opposed to mere competition. Both social groups and the social spirit have found their origin and their highest expression in the sex-reproductive institution, the family. The family and its spirit have won even in competition with

competition, because non-competition and coöperation as practiced there, are of selective value. In a society which is consciously experimenting toward its own improvement it will become increasingly true, therefore, that wherever individual impulses and preferences are vitally in conflict with social aims—even tentative and experimental aims—the individual choices and liberty must be modified or inhibited for the sake of society. Because sex and reproductive impulses and behavior and relations are always social rather than individual in their expressions and always profoundly important for the society which grows out of them, they in a peculiar sense cannot be left to individual whim and caprice.

In other words, the conflict between self-indulgence in respect of sex and the social use of sex and reproduction must take place within the individual and he must be trained by an enlightened society to subordinate the personal values and expressions of sex to the welfare of the mate, of the children, and of the larger society. The average human being can be so trained. This attitude of reconciling the personal sex desires with the home and family ideal is more a matter of right training and culture than of nature; but it cannot safely be brought about by mere outer social compulsion and repression. It calls for constructive education of habits and emotions.

Modern Attacks on Monogamous Marriage

Growing partly out of this natural disposition of the individual to put the incidental function of sex indulgence ahead of the primary purposes and functions of sex as a means of adjustment and as adjunct to reproducing, and partly out of the crudities and shortcomings of monogamy as practiced among us, the practice and the ideal of monogamy have been severely attacked in recent times. Some of

the criticisms are: that monogamic marriage has failed as a means of sex happiness and adjustment, as shown by the large percentage of unhappy marriages which end in separation and divorce, or in antagonisms, and boredom; that it has failed in its care and education of children, as shown by the high infant death rate, the ignorance of parents in all matters of education, and the high percentage of young people in all aspects of character; that monogamy has never been accepted fully in practice by any people or civilization, as evidenced by unfaithfulness in the form of open or clandestine prostitution, concubinage, and the like; that human beings are not really monogamous in character, and hence in forcing monogamy by social fiat we are running counter to the essential nature of man; that the social and economic status of woman in marriage is undemocratic and against the best personal development of both sexes; and that a large proportion of both men and women do not marry at all, and hence under this system are entirely cut off from approved mating and parenthood.

While most of these pleas contain elements which are directly false or at best specious, there is enough of point in most of them to demand that they receive the careful consideration of all friends of the monogamous family. To illustrate both the truth and the fallacy in these attacks: it is true that our improved consciousness and its emphasis on sex impulses and its increase of the desire for novelty, variety, amusement, and adventure have raised impulses which compete strongly with those which make for constancy and monogamy. While this makes control and constancy more difficult in practice, one does violence to the truth to make of this a plea that man is by his instincts a polygamous or polyerotic animal rather than a monogamous one. His instincts are merely not perfect enough to meet automatically the lures of his more sophisticated conscious-

ness. As to the success of marriage, one's answer is largely in the point of view. It is certainly true that many marriages fail both in producing character and happiness for the mates and in introducing children suitably prepared in habits and in character for social living. A sane, consistent education of the young for marriage as the most important adventure of life would greatly decrease the failures. It is claimed that more than three-fourths of the people who undertake the retail grocery business fail completely. Now any such business is a task infinitely more simple and easy than that of bringing together in the intimate and psychically complex relations of home-making two people of different nature and different nurture. While there are few homes that register a complete success in all their opportunities and aims, those which fail completely are much less than that reported for retail grocers. Much the same can be said of our other social ventures. We can pick no type of social institution—governments, schools, industries, churches—which have come more nearly than the home to making their appropriate contribution to the human race.

Some Proposed Modifications of Monogamous Marriages

The social evolution of man has gradually and formally included the following elements in marriage:

1. Complete and exclusive possession by and faithfulness to the other mate. In practice and for reasons foreign to marriage itself this has been held as less binding on the male than on the female.

2. Permanency. This has been subject to numerous exceptions.

3. That it is a relation, both in respect of sex and parenthood, so important to society as to give the group certain rights and sanctions in it. These sanctions have

taken two chief forms, making it: (a) an ordinance of religion and under the control of religious authorities; and (b) a contract under the control of the civil or political unit.

4. That the home is the chief social unit for producing, protecting, caring for, and educating children for society. Owing to technical progress in many things, as education, health, care, etc., society is taking (as it should) increasing steps to aid the home in these functions.

The modifications which are proposed by the critics of monogamy are aimed at all these elements. It is proposed that there shall be freedom within marriage for additional sex relations and even for parenthood on the part of either mate with outsiders, and similarly that the unmarried shall mate and become parents without prejudice ("free love"); that marriage shall be temporary and experimental in order that mates may test their ability or willingness to adjust themselves to one another and, not finding this, to separate without let or prejudice ("trial marriage"); that mating is a natural and organic relation and is therefore no more to be considered a religious ordinance than eating and drinking; that love and sex relations are personal to the individuals concerned and offer no right of control or enforcement by the civil group as contracts; that children should be brought up in institutions guided by experts who will see that they have the best physical, mental, and social guidance because the parents are inexperienced, untrained, and emotionally unfit to train them in a scientific manner.

Weakness of Substitutes

The brevity of this book will not allow that we try to meet all these criticisms of marriage or to discuss the pro-

posed substitutes. There is space for only a few somewhat fundamental observations.

1. It will readily be seen that most of these suggestions run directly counter to the course of evolution of sex and reproduction in man and all the higher animals. They tend to separate the two functions putting the sex relations wholly into the hands of the mates; and placing responsibility for care and rearing of offspring upon organized society. Both instinctive evolution in animals and conscious evolution among humans have, on the contrary, bound these functions closer and closer together and this has operated for the betterment of both. It is just this connection which has gradually refined the crassness of the sex urge and has made it more tender and spiritual and social by the responsibility for care of offspring. By this very connection evolution has partly socialized the most powerful and lusty animal appetite we have, and has even made it a servant in helping give birth to the home, the one institution which has reasonably succeeded in checking within itself the selfishness and competition seen elsewhere in human relations. The child-producing and child-rearing functions have developed the humanizing parental sentiments and at the same time have made possible the permanent friendly and considerate adjustments of mates. While the practice and technic of permanent love have not become perfect, we have nowhere else in human relations anything which approaches our best or even our average examples of it as seen in marriage. And in spite of parental shortcomings no social institutions have yet been devised which can compete with even the average family as a place for the social and emotional culture of children.

2. At bottom all these suggestions are in rebellion against subordinating individual freedom, initiative, and indulgence to social progress and control in a group of functions which

are of commanding importance to society. They look toward getting the thrills out of sex without the responsibilities and pains of mutual adjustment or of child-rearing. They would seek to substitute a temporary adjustment ready-made under the spell of novelty, by shifting from one mate to another or make adjustment unnecessary by retreat, rather than hammer it out by self-denial and coöperation. They would make more easy the licentious and self-gratifying elements of love and make more difficult the self-denying and self-sacrificing impulses. They would remove the incentives for making love and marriage social and human.

3. All such demands of personal indulgence, essentially deny that there are any means of reconciling the individual impulses with the social needs, and assume that where these are in conflict the individual desires should be supreme. Such an attitude inevitably destroys the possibility of coöperation of individuals in a rational society. As human society has progressed and has prospered in intelligence, it has rightly developed more and more concern for perfecting the individual and has stimulated persons as persons to seek out their rights and their privileges; but this has always been and can only be on condition that the improved individual in turn shall voluntarily put the social welfare ahead of his own selfish pleasures, where these conflict.

4. These proposals always hold out the hope that human beings may gain release from sex tensions and unhappiness by such relaxations of sex faithfulness. Aside from the fact that pleasure and happiness of the mates are not the primary meaning of sex and mating from either a biological or a human point of view, the hope is a false one. As a matter of fact the unhappiness of those who are poorly mated is as nothing compared with the uncertainty and anguish of individuals, particularly of women, under a régime whose

sole point lies in releasing mates from any personal obligation and in putting all selfish premiums upon breaking faith.

5. We have no evidence whatever, least of all in the behavior of many of the advocates of the relaxed sex life, that human character has evolved to the place where complete freedom of sex relations would result in a greater constancy and perfection of family life than with formal demands put upon the mates by organized society, as is sometimes claimed.

Problems of the Unhappily Married

The difficulties of those who for any reason are failing in making marriage mean all that it should mean cannot be met merely by insisting that they should do better. On the other hand society is quite in accord with what seems to be the basic organic nature and value of marriage when it insists that easy happiness of mates is neither the chief purpose, nor value of marriage. The success of a marriage, therefore, is not to be measured primarily by comfort and happiness. It is rather to be seen in the degree to which the parents will adjust themselves to one another and meet the pains and sacrifices and responsibilities of parenthood, of home-making, of rational rearing and socializing of children. Marriage, being the fullest and most representative life relation which comes to humans, is inevitably a mixture of pleasure-giving and pain-giving experiences. Unless human beings in these relations come to the point where they can get happiness from service, responsibility and sacrifice, and in spite of disappointments and mistakes, happiness is not possible. One of our troubles is that we have conceived the happiness "ever after" of marriage in a purely romantic and selfish sense. The happiness of marriage, if we are fortunate enough to achieve it, is a matter of understanding, of tastes,

ideals, attitudes, labor, purpose, sacrifices, and infinite tact and adjustment. Divorce, easy or hard, does not reach the marrow. Easy divorce doubtless causes many who might make a success of relations to cease trying when the first flush of romance is gone. While divorce is, therefore, a mere registration of failure, it is nevertheless often desirable, in the sense that a surgical operation may be, to end a hopeless pathological condition.

This group of problems is in no sense an arraignment, as it is sometimes made, of marriage. It is an arraignment of our failure to educate and of our actual miseducation of young people with respect to love and marriage and homemaking.

Mating, the relations of mates, and the relation of the parents and children have been in the past the most important selective factors in the progress of humanity. Hence nothing but the most painstaking study and education of the young in this whole group of problems can give to marriage its full success. Such education for marriage is prophylactic, preventive—the only sane and rational cure of evils.

Problems of the Unmarried

The problem of non-marriage is not normal to sex and reproductive tendencies and impulses. Celibacy is rarely a matter of purely personal preference. Failure to marry and to accept the normal functions of sex and parenthood is the outcome of incidental factors, such as economic conditions and standards, æsthetic standards, family education, war, emigration, religious conventions, and a thousand and one artificial elements. They are by-products of our social activity and development, and not native to human nature.

Facing the fact that large numbers of men and women are kept from marriage and parenthood, and thus from the

normal expectations of life in this whole rich field of sex and reproduction, what solution is possible for the unmarried?

The theories which have been held may be reduced to two:

1. That the unmarried must, in the interests of society, be expected to live a truly celibate and abstinent life; that they must refrain from parenthood and from the sex relations which normally lead to parenthood. This is the view accepted by those who most emphasize the value of marriage as a contract or its sacredness as an ordinance, and the rights of children to a complete home with two permanent parents.

2. That the unmarried, because of the normal and basic character of sex, love, and parenthood, should be allowed to make their own choices of free sex relations and of parenthood, without prejudice to their standing and reputation.

Clearly these two views represent completely antagonistic philosophies of the social meaning and nature of marriage. There is not space here to discuss them at length. The writer must be content with expressing his conviction that countenancing free-love relations among the unmarried would tend to mean the substitution of promiscuity for orderly family life by putting all the premiums of freedom, variety, irresponsibility in the balance against the form of sex relation and family structure and spirit which development has sanctioned. The permanent, monogamous family has been selected in the process of evolution and cannot therefore be essentially false to the realities. It is itself a powerful selective agency in the bettering of human personality and human adjustment.

The following facts and opinions, put forward tentatively

here without argument, will give a part of the ground for the above conclusions.

1. Society can do much by education and social reorganization to remove the causes of non-marriage without threatening the home structure and stable home life which are more normal to human nature and more healthful than is promiscuous sex life. This is the first duty of an aroused society.

2. Society cannot allow to an exceptional minority, however large, a type of irresponsible sex life which, if it should become general, would destroy the home itself.

3. While marriage, with sex intercourse and parenthood, is a normal expectation for human beings, neither sex intercourse nor parenthood is necessary for complete physical, sexual, or mental development, for physical or mental health, for happiness, nor for a successful or useful personal or social life.

4. Recognizing that no mode of life is so rich and developing as successful married family life, it still remains true that there are compensating forms of service to humanity and of happiness open to the mass of young women and men who do not marry, which amount in some degree to an unselfish substitute parenthood. As in marriage itself success in this sort of life is a matter of character and service. Those services of the race can and should be more recognized and honored by society. To indicate all the changes in educational, social, political, economic, business, and spiritual life, which are involved in the enrichment of the opportunities of unmarried women, would take us too far afield; but this whole group of problems takes its place among the most vital that we face.

5. Psychologically and æsthetically (leaving out of consideration moral elements altogether) irregular and promiscuous sex intercourse without permanent bonds and mutual obligations can never be a satisfactory substitute for married life, either to the individual or to society.

It is easy enough to mention these solutions based on education and social reorganization, but they strike at the very roots not only of our personal appetites but of our social and economic structure; and to put them into practice calls for more conscious and rational purpose and more social spirit than we have yet shown about any enterprise whatsoever. But the goal is well worth the trial; and it is certainly better to socialize our questionable organizations and practices than it is to degrade the most beneficent and social of our institutions.

THE BIOLOGICAL BASIS OF THE FAMILY *

HERBERT SPENCER JENNINGS

Herbert Spencer Jennings was born at Tonica, Illinois, April 8th, 1868, the son of Dr. George N. and Olive Taft Jennings.

He was graduated from the University of Michigan in 1893. In 1895 he received his M.A. degree from Harvard and in 1896 his Ph.D. In 1896 and 1897 he studied in Jena, Germany. In 1909 he received the degree of LL.D. from Clark University and a degree of S.D. from the University of Michigan in 1918.

He was Professor of Botany at Montana State Agricultural College from 1897 to 1898; Instructor in Zoölogy at Dartmouth College from 1898 to 1899; Assistant Professor of Zoölogy at the University of Michigan from 1900 to 1903; Assistant Professor of Zoölogy at the University of Pennsylvania from 1903 to 1905; Professor of Experimental Zoölogy from 1906 to 1910. Since then he has been the Henry Walters Professor of Zoölogy and Director of the Zoölogical Laboratory at Johns Hopkins University.

He is a specialist in research work on physiology of micro-organisms, animal behavior, and genetics. He is a director of the U. S. Fish Commission, Trustee of the Marine Biological Laboratory, Woods Hole, Mass. Bio-Metrician U. S. Food Administration, 1917-1918. Member of the National Research Council, 1922-1927.

He is the Associate Editor of the *Journal of Experimental Zoölogy of Genetics* and of the *Journal of Comparative Psychology*. From 1908 to 1909 he was President of the American Zoölogical Society, and from 1910 to 1911 of the American Society of Naturalists. He is a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. He is an honorary Fellow of the Royal Micros. Society of Great Britain. Member of the National Academy of Sciences, The American Philosophical Society, the Academy of Natural Sciences, Society Experimental Biology and Medicine.

He is the author of *The Anatomy of the Cat; Behavior of Lower Organisms; Life and Death; Heredity and Evolution in Unicellular Organisms; Prometheus—or Biology and the Advancement of Man.* He is a contributor to numerous papers in zoölogical and physiological journals.

The following chapter is taken from his recently published book, *The Biological Basis of Human Nature.*

---

* Published in *Family Life Today* (Houghton, Mifflin Co.) and *The Biological Basis of Human Nature* (W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., New York, 1930, and reprinted with the full consent of both publishers and author.

NOTHING touching the family is foreign to biology, since biology is the science of the living. But conventionally, a biological treatment of man means that we are too look upon him as one animal among many and deal with matters that are common to him with the rest. We should not feel that such treatment is brutalizing. Man is gradually coming to the kindlier and happier attitude that all living things are brethren: with similar problems: with the same sort of deep-lying foundation for their activities. The biological basis of the family, therefore, is to be interpreted as its relation to the great underlying physiological processes; to development; to the interchange of matter and energy; to behavior; to reproduction. It is with this that I shall attempt to deal. It will not be my province to speak for or against the preservation or modification or abolition of the family as found in man, but only to show its relation to the central organic processes. This may aid in forming a judgment as to its function and value.

All organisms show two sets of activities that are to a certain extent in opposition. They live individually and they reproduce. Each individual has its own life career; it grows, develops, seeks and takes nutrition, pursues its varied business and desires, becomes mature; most organisms finally become old and die. And in addition each produces new individuals that shall take its place when its individual career is closed.

Now all organisms find—as human beings find and some loudly proclaim—that the business of reproduction interferes with their careers. The two things interact, intertwine, modify each other. This occurs differently in different organisms: there result many diverse systems, diverse institutions. Among these diverse systems is the family, in its various types and gradations, as we find it in man and in other animals. The number and variety of systems arising

from the interaction of reproduction with the pursuit of the life career are so great as to defy enumeration. But an examination of certain typical situations will illustrate the rôle of the family.

The life career of some organisms is so simple and their reproduction is so simple that there is little interference. In some of my favorite pets, the rotifers, the individual simply drops here and there pieces of itself, which grow into new individuals. There is no mating and there is no further relation of parent with offspring. Yet even here the life career is somewhat modified; part of the parent's nutrition goes into these pieces, and their separation from the parent may be a severe operation.

And even in such cases the beginning of the family may appear. In some animals the piece or germ remains attached to the parent body, there growing and developing, feeding through the parent's mouth and sharing the parent's career. Several such offspring may remain attached to one parent; then we have a veritable incipient family, though with but one parent. A budding hydra, a colonial infusorian, shows us such an embryo family.

But animals that require two parents find the matter much more complex. Why most of us require not merely one parent but two is one of the great and perhaps unanswered questions of biology. But certainly this increases enormously the variety and complexity of life; multiplies by thousands its problems and difficulties; perhaps also its interests and satisfactions. There is added to the life career the problem of finding and uniting with the mate; a problem much more difficult than that presented by the performance of most other functions. It requires specialized structures, specialized functions, specialized reactions. The seeking of the mate becomes one of the chief impulses changing the development and behavior of organisms, playing everywhere a tremen-

dous rôle. It seems one of the chief bases of structural and mental evolution.

At its lowest, reproduction from two parents is still carried out in a relatively simple way. In some organisms the individuals simply cast their germ cells abroad, leaving them to unite or to fail, as chance may dictate; leaving the united product to develop as best it may. Such is the situation in many plants; in many aquatic animals. But as the life career becomes more complex, this does not suffice. The mates must seek and find each other. This becomes one of the main features of the life career. A difference arises between the two mates. One does most of the seeking, and carries minute germ cells that move and actively unite with those from the other mate. We call this the male. The other, the female, produces and carries large germ cells in which she stores up food for the development of the young. Here appears the deepest duality of life, the difference of the sexes. The life career in both sexes is much altered by the mode of reproduction, but in the male far less than in the female. The production of the large germ cells, the storing of food within them, the carrying of them, and their disposition—these things form for the female a large part of the business of life. The special problems of feminism begin far back in the animal series.

And this is but the first step in a long process. The life career of the female becomes still more profoundly altered when the egg, even after union with the germ cell from the male, remains attached to the body of the mother, receiving protection and nutrition, till a certain stage of development is reached. We find among animals all stages in this union. In some it goes but a little way. The female carries the egg merely till it is ready to hatch, then casts it abroad. In others the union becomes longer and more intimate, till we reach the condition found in the group to which man

belongs, the mammals. Here the young is long identified with the parent. The new individual is not cast on its own resources until it has reached a rather advanced stage of development.

This intimate union for a long period of parent and offspring has large consequences. The development of the offspring is greatly changed and the parent is modified hardly less; her entire physiology—metabolic, glandular, nervous, mental is tremendously influenced. In this union of parent and offspring we have another major factor in development and behavior comparable to that due to the requirements of mating. But this union affects directly but one of the parents, the female; the family at its beginning includes but mother and offspring. The male still retains his freedom, save for the mating requirement.

But the chain binding the male to his mate brings him, too, under the domination of the developing offspring. His mate is under a heavy handicap while carrying the developing young. Her life career, so weighted down, becomes inadequate to nutrition and protection. The life career of the male, already greatly modified for the seeking of the female, becomes further changed toward retaining possession of her; toward feeding and protecting her while carrying and guarding the young. This situation we find widespread; in fishes, in birds, in mammals, the male protects and aids the female. The economic dependence of the female has begun.

Parallel with this we find another step. The wide-reaching influence of the young on the mother does not disappear at once on its separation from her body. It remains a source of reactions, an object of interest, after it has become free. The parent from which it has separated continues to protect it, to supply it food, to keep it under conditions favorable to its further development. Complex structures, com-

plex activities arise in carrying out these functions. The life career is deeply modified. This becomes almost its chief motif. The mother wasp prepares food for the future young—a spider or larva that has been stupefied—deposits the eggs in this. The bird mother builds a nest, keeps the eggs warm, feeds the young. The family has now developed further, but in the simpler cases it still consists mainly of the offspring with but one of the two parents, the female.

But the male, too, becomes drawn into this work. The female and her behavior have become the strongest source of stimuli for the male. Her concern with the offspring must deeply influence him. At times his relation to the progeny appears but indirect. He protects the female; the progeny too are protected. In places it is more direct. The drawing of the life activities of the male into the circle of family life appears, as we survey the animal kingdom, in curious, isolated, and unexpected ways. The male catfish of certain species takes the eggs in his mouth and there holds and protects them until the young can care for themselves. Certain male toads take the eggs on their backs and there carry them until the young animals hatch and escape. In various fish the male helps to build and guard the nest, and takes part in protecting the swimming young. Some male birds help build the nest; feed the female while she keeps the eggs warm; take their turn at that work; help to feed the young. In some mammals the male concerns himself little or hardly at all with these domestic matters; in others he plays an active rôle in providing a home and caring for the young.

Along with this intertwining of the life careers of parent the offspring, there come changes in the relation of the two parents to each other. In some animals the relation is but a passing one; the male seeks the female; then, after union of the germ cells, separates from her; they consort no more; and the next mating will be with another individual, or as

chance may direct. But as the development of the young comes to be dependent on the parent or parents, as the parents feed, protect, and guide the young, the behavior of each parent becomes correlated with that of the other; they coöperate. The mating relation is continued between the same parents. We find here perhaps two main lines of evolution. In one group, typically, each male mates with a limited number of females, which he protects from enemies and defends from other males, incidentally protecting their young. The polygamous family has arisen: the herd or flock, headed by a single male, as in cattle, in seals, and in many mammals.

The polygamous family presents biological difficulties. Since in most species the number of males and females is approximately the same, the appropriation of several females by one male results in the exclusion of many males from propagation; results consequently in perpetual war among the males. Since in the nature of the case it is the more powerful warriors among the males that become parents of the next generation, this method of organization results in selective elimination in favor of the warlike; cuts out the pacifists, operates against the development of the virtues of peace, keeps society at war. As might be expected, in such polygamous families the males have little direct concern with the care of the young beyond the protection of the flock as a whole. Their business is mainly fighting and propagation.

But in those more numerous cases where the male becomes directly involved in the business of caring for the individual young produced by a particular mother, coöperation between a single male and a single female becomes the rule. Care of their common young keeps them together; the mating relation continues; successive children may be born to the same pair. What we usually think of as the family has come into existence; two parents and their offspring living together,

carrying on their life careers in unison; sharing nutriment and protection; coöperating in activities. Such families are found in a great number of animals of diverse groups. They are by no means a peculiarly human institution.

The duration of the family relation depends much on the length of time the young are so imperfect as to require assistance, and also in a minor degree, on whether propagation is seasonal. In birds, in many mammals, mating occurs only at particular periods of the year, and the young are dependent for but a short time; the family then remains a unit only for the same length of time; then the parents separate from the children, and the two parents part, carrying on independent careers. In some cases, as in the pigeons, two successive broods of young overlap; the second one begins before the first has left the parents. In such cases the two parents remain mated, bringing up together two families of young. But at the end of the season they separate, each pursuing his own career, and at the next season each may enter into a family with a new mate.

But there exist or arise in many animals powerful biological influences that favor a coöperative career of the parents lasting for more than one season; or for life. The attraction of the mates for each other, combined with the effect of habit, itself acts powerfully in this direction. In the eagles, hawks, and other birds of prey, this keeps the mates together for life; a permanent monogamous marriage is here found. Successive families of young are produced, and though there intervene periods in which the parents are without young, the union of mates is for life.

In other animals this tendency toward a permanent coöperative life career on the part of the two parents is powerfully reënforced by the long period of dependence of the young. The development of the offspring to maturity requires not one season but many. The two parents, car-

ing jointly for the young, remain together. The offspring come, not in broods, but singly. Succeeding children overlap in their developmental careers. There is no time when the two parents can separate without breaking in upon the functions they have undertaken in relation to the young. Such is the situation we find in the higher anthropoids, the orang and the gorilla; such is the situation found at its highest development in man.

Meanwhile, too, the life career in such organisms has become full of complex activities of other sorts, requiring for their proper performance the undistracted attention of the individual, and all this is intertwined with the care, protection, and guidance of the young. To break the mating relation at any particular time is to bring all this into confusion; is to leave children and mate in distress; is to leave unfulfilled the mating impulse; is to force the separated mates anew into the intensely distracting pursuit of finding a new mate. All this is avoided by the mates remaining together. Even as age comes on, and the last of the offspring has taken up its own career, so that the biological relations with progeny no longer require coöperation on the part of the parents, long use and habit, the persistence of the need for companionship, keep together the two parents. Marriage is lifelong, even though the care of the offspring is not. Permanent monogamous marriage has arisen independently through similiar functional requirements, in the mammals and in the birds; the biological needs giving origin to it being much the more numerous and powerful in the higher mammals. It is emphatically not true, as is so often asserted with assumed finality, that the only function of marriage is the production of children. On the contrary, marriage and the family are a complex resultant from the interaction of many functional needs. The satisfaction of the powerful mating impulse, one of the chief factors in

organic evolution, reënforced as it is by many structural and functional complexes that have arisen in connection with it, is one of the major elements concerned. The thwarting of all that is connected with this impulse profoundly affects and deranges the life career. No institution that leaves this function unfulfilled can be considered a biologically adequate one.

Such, then, is the family as we find it in monogamous birds and mammals, and in man; a life correlation, a union, of the careers of the two mates, and of both with the careers of the successive children till these are self-supporting. Its chief biological bases, in distinction from other systems found in organisms, are, in addition to the fundamental mating impulse and the production of young, the helplessness of the children at first, demanding parental support; the long time required for their development to the period of self-help; the marked handicapping of the female while the children are infantile; the lack in man of a seasonal period of mating and reproduction; the overlapping of the immature periods of the successive children; and the complexity of the individual life career, with the intertwining of its manifold activities with these reproductive relations. The monogamous family, with lifelong union of the mates, appears as the final term in a long evolutionary series.

As we examine the varied animal world we find another set of relations appearing, leading to a different culmination. Groups larger than a single monogamus family act together for support and protection. Indeed, the single family itself develops into such a group, when its members remain together after the progeny have themselves reached the period of mating. Still more readily is such a group formed from the polygamous family, of the male with many females; the herd protects itself and all its parts by common action. Society as a whole takes over many of the functions

of the family. This situation, too, exists in man as a supplement to the monogamous family. At a certain period before maturity the school takes over in certain relations the care of the young.

But this condition cannot readily reach its extreme development—society cannot fully supplant the family—in organisms where, as in mammals, there is a long-continued intimate union of offspring with parent, during which the child is brought to a considerably advanced state of development. Society cannot take over this parental function. And by that long and intimate union both parent and offspring are so fundamentally modified, in structural, physiological, and mental constitution, as to place great obstacles in the way of society's assuming control of the children even soon after birth.

It is in organisms not showing this intimate union of parent and offspring that we meet most highly developed this exercise by society as a whole of the functions taken elsewhere by the family; it is in certain of the insects that we find the culmination of this system. In these social insects the two parents play little part in life save in the production and bringing together of the germ cells. The life of the species—the individual life careers—are carried on by individuals that are not parents—non-sexual individuals. Such is the situation in some of the ants; in some of the bees, in termites. In social organization these, as William Morton Wheeler has brought out, have passed to a stage in evolution much beyond that of man; though whether for better or for worse is another question; and it is another question, too, whether this is a line of evolution that man can or must follow.

In these ants and bees the functions of the parents have become purely propagatory; beyond this they have practically no life career. One female in the state is selected as mother.

She is fostered and fed and protected for the eggs she produces; the other females are destroyed or transformed by special treatment into non-sexual individuals. The males as such play a rôle only in that one of them fertilizes the single group mother; after one has done this, all other males may be destroyed; or in other cases they too are transformed, like the females, into neutral individuals. Society is non-sexual; carried on, not by husbands and wives, fathers and mothers, but by neuters. The whole distracting business of mating, or marrying and giving in marriage, is cut out of these societies; the individuals can apply themselves wholeheartedly to their life careers. The young produced by the group mother are cared for by certain of these neutral workers who make this their life business. The family does not exist; it is a state in evolution that has been left behind, transcended. The attainment of some such situation appears to be the aspiration of certain groups of men.

Such, then, are perhaps the chief types of situations that we find in the organisms as the working-out of the interactions of reproduction and the other business of the life career. One main line of development culminates in the monogamous family, as found in some birds, the higher anthropoids, and man; the other in the highly organized society without families, of the social insects.

When now we turn to a closer examination of the situation in man, we discover that here, as in so many other relations, man forms, either in concrete realization or in tendency and aspiration, a sort of abstract and brief chronicle of the entire biological series. In the main perhaps he represents the fully or incompletely developed monogamous family. But we find, too, scattered in the highly differentiated groups of mankind a number of the diverse phases that occur in the different groups of animals. Man cannot indeed go back to the phase of more isolated individuals;

the mother at least is for a long time actually physically identified with the child; and even after the child has left her body she is held almost as powerfully united with it, though in a different way. But the male is in man as everywhere else less identified with the offspring; and there occur scattered individuals who tend to revert to the ancient type in which the males serve in the work of reproduction merely as fertilizers of the egg, leaving the rest of the work of the family to the female. These seem on the whole to be but sporadic throw-backs. Biologically they cannot be considered adequate members of society; at least not unless and until society becomes organized on some such plan as we find in the bees and ants, making the males largely superfluous. There exist species in which this otiose and incompetent condition of the males has developed far; in which (as in rotifers) the males are but a few short-lived dwarfs, without life career aside from propagation. It is not true, as recent magazine authors have asserted it to be, that the male must in the nature of things be more powerful and efficient than the female. On the contrary, in many animals the male is the weaker vessel, even rudimentary; to the point in some species of complete extinction, leaving the species to consist only of females. For in organisms in which there is sex, the female is indispensable while the male is not; the female can carry on the race alone, and does so.

More widely occurring in man than this tendency of the male to abdicate his rôle in the family are certain phases of partial development of the family. There exists in man the condition in which the single male possesses several of many females and acts as the head of the entire complex group; a condition found in many mammals of the cattle kind, as well as in others. There occur in man also situations hardly found in other animals; as that in which the female has a definite and limited number of husbands, and various com-

binations or modifications of these two systems. Systems of this sort cannot prevail without excluding many individuals from propagation with the consequent distraction and warfare that this brings. The polygamous system is sometimes defended on the ground that it is stronger, more warlike males that become the parents of the next generation, the weaker ones being excluded; a measure that is held to be of eugenic value, resulting in continued selection and consequent steady raising (in a certain direction) of the level of the population. But whether this notion is sound or unsound, the tendencies of the human race appear distinctly against this condition and it seems certain to disappear; it yields disturbances, distractions, and other consequences that are felt to be undesirable. The monogamous family appears at present the system of greatest stability in man, though it is itself filled with irregularities and unstable points.

Another system proposed for man and to some extent practiced is that of temporary families, such as we find in many birds and other animals. Individuals are to become mates for a longer or shorter period, separating as they please. This system, unless supplemented in some radical way, as by social care of the offspring, ignores the long period of dependence of the children on the parents; the result of which is that the frequent separation or change of mates gives serious wrenches to the framework of society; injures the children, distracts and distresses the parents. This system, therefore, cannot be held to meet adequately the difficult problems of the relations of parent and offspring; cannot be considered an efficient system for smooth social working, for peace and prosperity. If defended, it must be by the extreme selectionist who holds that severe and unfavorable living conditions, with a high death rate, are in the long run advantageous to the species. If combined with the prevention of the production of offspring, as often proposed,

and as seems indispensable if it is not to give rise to immediate distress and dislocation, it must result in the extinction of the species; or else it must prevail in only part of the population, another part living under some system adequate to the care of the offspring. This distinction into two such groups seems likely to result in discord.

In some quarters we meet an aspiration for a system showing the essential features of that found in those insects whose social organization had advanced far beyond our own; a system in which from the beginning the social group as a whole shall care for the offspring, thus making the family unnecessary. In this way the individual parents are to be relieved; set free each to pursue his or her life career without interference from offspring or mate. As we find it in popular modern proposals, this aspiration appears largely dominated by the desire to set free and give full satisfaction to the mating impulses; to facilitate change of mates, making it unnecessary for them to remain tied to one another longer than fancy dictates. If we examine this aspect of the matter in the animals that have fully carried out this system of public care for the progeny, we find a surprising result. The system has resulted, not in the freeing of the mating impulses, but in their suppression; their almost complete extinction; in the essential desexualization of society. Only a few isolated individuals continue to be occupied with mating and propagation; the rank and file are sexless. If man must look to this result, possibly the enthusiasm for this system will abate.

Indeed, it appears that man must meet very great difficulty in inaugurating any thoroughgoing system of social care of the offspring, through the fact that he has already made extensive progress in the opposite direction—in the direction of care of the offspring by the immediate parents; through the fact that he is a mammal instead of an insect. In the

insects the mother has never been long and intimately identified with the offspring until it is far developed, as is the case in man. That long and physical union has modified all her characteristics, and through her those of the species as a whole; for inheritance occurs in many respects from one sex to the other. In man separation of parent from offspring is impossible for a long period, and if hurried, even after physical union has ceased, it may turn out that this will lead to a serious injury to parent and offspring. To discover the proper period for separation of the lives of the two is a matter for long and careful study; for observation and experimentation; not for the application of *a priori* principles.

It may indeed be questioned whether man has not been too late in starting on a radical plan for the supplanting of the family by society as a whole. To make a thorough success of this, he should have begun it æons ago, before he became a mammal. In that case by the present time he might perhaps hope to rival the ants in social organization.

A valiant and venturesome attempt to meet this difficulty lies in the suggestion of J. B. S. Haldane in his booklet on *Science and the Future;* and Charlotte Haldane has pictured for us society as it may be after the plan is carried out. The human germ gland is to be cultivated artificially and impersonally in isolation by modern methods of tissue culture. The germ cells likewise are to be developed from the start in incubators; these to be followed by other public institutions for later stages, till development and education are complete. Such a proposal helps to visualize the very great biological difficulty involved in the attempt to change the direction of evolution of man; to reverse the long course he has traveled toward the family system; to transform him from a mammal to something else; to start him on a course leading to replacement of the family and the parent by society as a whole. Evolution is never closed; and what man

may become through millions of years of effort in that direction no one can say. But certainly a long and hard road would have to be traveled before that plan could be made a success. The varied difficulties presented by the present nature of man, the fact that he is a mammal, his long and helpless infancy, the high development of his mating and parental impulses, and his diversified and exacting life career appear to be met most adequately (though obviously still imperfectly) by the lifelong monogamous family.

And now a word further in biological characterization of such a family as we find in man. What are the peculiarities of the family, as a group of individuals?

The family is a small group of individuals that share in a common stock of genes, furnished by the two parents; and that also share a common environment, of which the members of the family are themselves the most potent factors. As compared with a set of individuals taken at random, their inherited differences are less and their environmental differences are less. But it is a serious error to assume uniformity in the family, in respect of either inheritance or environment. The method of shuffling, distributing, and recombining the genes of the parents insures that no child shall be like either parent in its genetic constitution; nor like any other child (with the probable exception of identical twins, derived from a single fertilized egg). In consequence of these genetic differences, the members of the family differ considerably in the way they develop; in the way they respond to a given environment; in their behavior under given conditions; in what we call temperament, mentality, character. Even if it were possible to make the environment the same for all members of the family, it is by no means to be expected that all should develop the same type of personality; there are deep-lying and far-reaching differences in their original constitutions.

But the effective environment, like the genetic constitution, is never the same for the different members of the family. Owing to the powerful organic relations uniting them—the mating relation, the parental relation—the diverse members act upon each other as the most effective environmental agents that touch them; profoundly affecting their development and behavior. The differences resulting from the multiplicity of life and the change of days insure that no two members shall have the same effective environment. This diversity of environment, like the diversity in genetic constitution, may also induce great differences in what we call temperament, mentality, character. Particularly effective in these respects, we are told by those who have studied the matter, are the things that happen in early life, from birth to say eighteen months, possibly also those that happen before birth. Even if the genetic constitutions of the members of the family were the same, these causes might be expected to induce differences in the traits of later life; though of the specific effects of particular happenings there is little knowledge, save that it appears that small events may have very great after effects.

And since both genetic constitution and effective environment are diverse for every member of the family, it may be difficult or impossible to know certainly to which set any later peculiarity is due; usually both have been at work. It is a favored occupation of students in one field or the other to argue that all important peculiarities of individuals are due exclusively to that one of these things whose effectiveness they have themselves studied; to heredity alone; or to environment alone: For a long period environment, training, was held responsible for everything. Then for some recent years the all-might of heredity has been the favored dogma. Now there is coming a reaction, doubtless a useful reaction, and, under the leadership of Watson and Behavior-

ists, the all-might of the environment is again proclaimed. It seems to be the fate of many doctrines to vibrate between two errors: so difficult is it for man to conceive that things are not due to single causes, but to the interaction of many. Biological science, rightly considered, supports neither of these extreme views. Environment can do much; a given "normal" individual (significant limitation) has a wide range of possibilities. Doubtless, as Watson sets forth, any such may become "doctor, lawyer, merchant, chief" (of a kind), depending on the effective environment. But not all have the same possibilities; some, made by the environment into doctors, become the poor sticks that we all know in that profession; others become Oslers and Welches. Children of different genetic constitution do not react in the same way to the same environment. One becomes Ludwig von Beethoven, "possessor of brains," the greatest musician of history; the other Johann von Beethoven, "possessor of property." What biological investigation indicates is that we shall find differences, fundamental differences, in members of the same family due to both categories of causes. The family is a small representative sample of society, whose members affect each other profoundly in both genetic constitution and effective environment. To reject either heredity or environment as potent in molding its members is a most serious error, leading to practices that are disastrous. To attribute all to heredity is doubtless the more harmful; it discourages effort; it promotes a fatalistic viewpoint. But to attribute all to environment is to encourage teacher and parent in the unfortunate belief that they can fashion all their unhappy subjects on a uniform plan; this is to promote that disastrous neglect of individuality which has in the past been the bane of home and school and society.

This aspect of the matter time does not permit following further. In brief summary, when we look at the world of

organisms, all under the necessity of finding some reconciliation or compromise between the individual life career and the functions of reproduction, we discover a varied and graded set of systems, tending to fork into two series, with diverse culminations. One series culminates in the lifelong monogamous family, finding exemplars in birds and mammals, with its highest development in man. The other series leads to thoroughgoing social control, with the family in the narrower sense non-existent; of this series the social insects form the culmination. The present needs of man are what have led to the establishment of the monogamous family, and it appears to meet these needs more fully than any other system yet devised.

LOVE IN THE GREAT SOCIETY *

WALTER LIPPMANN

Walter Lippmann, the editor of the New York *World,* is distinguished not only in the field of journalism and in the Science of Social Relationships, but is a recognized leader in the realm of philosophy and ethics.

He has had a distinguished career from the day of his graduation from Harvard in 1910. He was formerly an associate editor of the *New Republic* and Assistant to the Secretary of War, June to October, 1917. He had the honor of serving as Secretary of the organization directed by E. M. House to prepare data for the Peace Conference. During the war he served with distinction as a Captain of the U. S. Military Intelligence Department, attached to the Second Section of the General Staff, General Headquarters A. E. F., and as a member of the Commission to negotiate peace. He is a member of the American Academy of Politics and Social Science.

His *Preface to Morals,* out of which the following chapter is reproduced, has been hailed by many as the best expression and interpretation of that multitude who today are disillusioned and baffled by the problems of modern life, and who have failed to find satisfaction in traditional orthodoxy.

Among his other published works are the following: *A Preface to Politics; Drift and Mastery; The Stakes of Diplomacy; The Political Scene; Liberty and News; Public Opinion; The Phantom Public; Men of Destiny;* contributes to *Harper's, Atlantic, Vanity Fair, Foreign Affairs;* editor: *The Poems of Paul Mariett,* 1913.

1. *The External Control of Sexual Conduct*

WHILE the changes which modernity implies affect the premises of all human conduct, the problem as a whole engages the attention of relatively few persons. The larger number of men and women living within the orbit of the

* From Walter Lippmann's *A Preface to Morals.* Copyright, 1929, The Macmillan Company, and reprinted in this volume with the author's consent.

Great Society are no doubt aware that their inherited beliefs about religion, politics, business, and sex do not square entirely with the actual beliefs upon which they feel compelled to act. But the fundamental alterations in political and economic ideals which the machine technology is inducing come home to each man only indirectly and partially. The consequences are subtle, delayed, and what is even more important, they are outside the scope of the ordinary man's personal decision. There is little that is urgent, immediate, or decisive which he can do, even if he understands them, about the changes in the structure and purpose of industry and the state. Most men can manage, therefore, to live without ever attempting to decide for themselves any fundamental question about business or politics. But they can neither ignore changes in sexual relations nor do they wish to. It is possible for a man to be a socialist or an individualist without ever having to make one responsible decision in which his theories play any part. But what he thinks about divorce and contraception, continence and license, monogamy, prostitution, and sexual experience outside of marriage, are matters that are bound at some point in his life to affect his own happiness immediately and directly. It is possible to be hypocritical about sex. But it is not possible for any adult who is not an æsthetic to be indifferent. The affairs of state may be regulated by leaders. But the affairs of a man and a woman are inescapably their own.

That obviously is the reason why in the popular mind it is immediately assumed that when morals are discussed it is sexual morals that are meant. The morals of the politician and the voter, of the shareholder and executive and employee, are only moderately interesting to the general public: thus they almost never supply the main theme of popular fiction. But the relations between boy and girl, man and woman, husband and wife, mistress and lover, parents and children,

are themes which no amount of repetition makes stale. The explanation is obvious. The modern audience is composed of persons among whom only a comparatively negligible few are serenely happy in their personal lives. Popular fiction responds to their longings: to the unappeased it offers some measure of vicarious satisfaction, to the prurient an indulgence, to the worried, if not a way out, then at least the comfort of knowing that their secret despair is a common, and not a unique, experience.

Yet in spite of this immense preoccupation with sex it is extraordinarily difficult to arrive at any reliable knowledge of what actual change in human behavior it reflects. This is not surprising. In fact this is the very essence of the matter. The reason it is difficult to know the actual facts about sexual behavior in modern society is that sexual behavior eludes observation and control. We know that the old conventions have lost most of their authority because we cannot know about, and therefore can no longer regulate, the sexual behavior of others. It may be that there is, as some optimists believe, a fine but candid restraint practiced among modern men and women. It may be that incredible licentiousness exists all about us, as the gloomier prophets insist. It may be that there is just about as much unconventional conduct and no more than there has always been. Nobody, I think, really knows. Nobody knows whether the conversation about sex reflects more promiscuity or less hypocrisy. But what everybody must know is that sexual conduct, whatever it may be, is regulated personally and not publicly in modern society. If there is restraint it is, in the last analysis, voluntary; if there is promiscuity, it can be quite secret.

The circumstances which have wrought this change are inherent in modern ways of living. Until quite recently the main conventions of sex were enforced first by the parents and then by the husband through their control over the life

of the woman. The main conventions were: first, that she must not encourage or display any amorous inclinations except where there was practical certainty that the young man's intentions were serious; second, that when she was married to the young man she submitted to his embraces only because the Lord somehow failed to contrive a less vile method of perpetuating the species. All the minor conventions were subsidiary to these; the whole system was organized on the premise that procreation was the woman's only sanction for sexual intercourse. Such control as was exercised over the conduct of men was subordinate to this control over the conduct of women. The chastity of women before marriage was guarded; that meant that seduction was a crime, but that relations with "lost" or unchaste women were tolerated. The virtuous man, by popular standards, was one who before his marriage did not have sexual relations with a virtuous woman. There is ample testimony in the outcries of moralists that even in the olden days these conventions were not perfectly administered. But they were sufficiently well administered to remain the accepted conventions, honored even in the breach. It was possible, because of the way people lived, to administer them.

The woman lived a sheltered life. That is another way of saying that she lived under the constant inspection of her family. She lived at home. She worked at home. She met young men under the zealous chaperonage of practically the whole community. No doubt, couples slipped away occasionally and more went on than was known or acknowledged. But even then there was a very powerful deterrent against an illicit relationship. This deterrent was the fear of pregnancy. That in the end made it almost certain that if a secret affair were consummated it could not be kept secret and that terrible penalties would be exacted. In the modern world effective chaperonage has become impracticable and

the fear of pregnancy has been virtually eliminated by the very general knowledge of contraceptive methods.

The whole revolution in the field of sexual morals turns upon the fact that external control of the chastity of women is becoming impossible.

2. *Birth Control*

The Biblical account of how Jehovah slew Onan for disobeying his father's commandment to go to his brother's widow, Tamar, and "perform the duty of an husband's brother," shows that the deliberate prevention of conception is not a new discovery. Mr. Harold Cox must be right when he says "it is fairly certain that in all ages and in all countries men and women have practiced various devices to prevent conception while continuing to indulge in sexual intercourse." For while I know of no positive evidence to support this, it appears to be self-evident that the human race within historical times has not multiplied up to the limits of human fecundity. Since it is hardly probable that this has been due to the continence of husbands, nor wholly to infanticide, abortion, infant mortality, and postponement of marriage, it is safe to conclude that birth control is an ancient practice.

Nevertheless, it was not until the nineteenth century that the practice of contraception began to be publicly advocated on grounds of public policy. Until the industrial age the weight of opinion was overwhelmingly in favor of very large families. Kings and nobles needed soldiers and retainers: "As arrows in the hand of a mighty man, so are the children of youth. Happy is the man that hath his quiver full of them. They shall not be ashamed, but they shall speak with the enemies in the gate." Fathers of families desired many sons. The early factory-owners could use abundant cheap labor. There had been men from Plato's time who had their

doubts about the value of an indefinitely growing population. But the substantial opinion down to the end of the eighteenth century was Adam Smith's that "the most decisive mark of the prosperity of any country is the increase of the number of its inhabitants."

Apparently it was the sinister character of the early factory system, and the ominous unrest which pervaded Europe after the French Revolution, which rather suddenly changed into pessimism this bland optimism about an ever growing population. Malthus published the first edition of his *Essay on Population* in 1798. This book is undoubtedly one of the great landmarks of human culture, for it focussed the attention of Europe on the necessity of regulating the growth of population. Malthus himself, it seems, hoped that this regulation could be achieved by the postponement of marriage and by continence. It is not clear whether he disapproved of what is now called neo-Malthusianism, or whether he did not regard it as practicable. Nevertheless, within less than twenty-five years James Mill in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* had in guarded fashion put forward the neo-Malthusian principle, and shortly thereafter, that is in 1823, an active public propaganda was set on foot, most probably by Francis Place, by means of what were known as the "diabolical handbills." These leaflets were addressed to the working classes and contained descriptions of methods for preventing conception. Some of them were sent to a good lady named Mrs. Fildes, who indignantly, but mistakenly from her point of view, assisted the nefarious propaganda by exposing it in the public prints. Fifty years later Mr. Bradlaugh and Mrs. Besant had themselves indicted and tried for selling an illustrated edition of Knowlton's *Fruits of Philosophy*. After that advertisement, neo-Malthusian principles and practices were known and were, therefore, available to all but the poorest and most illiterate.

No propaganda so threatening to the established moral order ever encountered such an ineffective opposition. I do not know how much money has been spent on the propaganda nor how many martyrs have had to coerce reluctant judges to try them. But it is evident that once it was known that fairly dependable methods of contraception exist, the people took the matter into their own hands. For the public reasons by which neo-Malthusianism was justified were also private reasons. The social philosopher said that population must be adjusted to the means of subsistence. Man and wife said that they must have only as many children as they could afford to rear. The eugenist said that certain stocks ought not to multiply. Individual women decided that too many children, or even any children, were bad for their health. But these were not the only reasons which explain the demand for neo-Malthusian knowledge. There was also the very plain demand due to a desire to enjoy sexual intercourse without social consequences.

On this aspect of birth control the liberal reformers have, I think, been until recently more than a little disingenuous. They have been arguing for the removal of the prohibitory laws, and they have built their case on two main theses. They have argued, first, that the limitation of births was sound public policy for economic and eugenic reasons; and second, that it was necessary to the happiness of families, the health of mothers, and the welfare of children. All these reasons may be unimpeachable. I think they are. But it was idle to pretend that the dissemination of this knowledge, even if legally confined to the instruction of married women by licensed physicians, could be kept from the rest of the adult population. Obviously that which all married couples are permitted to know every one is bound to know. Human curiosity will make that certain. Now this is what the Christian churches, especially the Roman Catholic, which

oppose contraception on principle, instantly recognized. They were quite right. They were quite right, too, in recognizing that whether or not birth control is eugenic, hygienic, and economic, it is the most revolutionary practice in the history of sexual morals.

For when conception could be prevented, there was an end to the theory that woman submits to the embrace of the male only for purposes of procreation. She had to be persuaded to coöperate, and no possible reason could be advanced except that the pleasure was reciprocal. She had to understand and assent inwardly to the principle that it is proper to have sexual intercourse with her husband and to prevent conception. She had, therefore, to give up the whole traditional theory which she may have only half-believed anyway, that sexual intercourse was an impure means to a noble end. She could no longer believe that procreation alone mitigated the vileness of cohabiting with a man, and so she had to change her valuation and accept it as inherently delightful. Thus by an inevitable process the practice of contraception led husbands and wives to the conviction that they need not be in the least ashamed of their desires for each other.

But this transvaluation of values within the sanctity of the marital chamber could hardly be kept a secret. What had happened was that married couples were indulging in the pleasures of sex because they had learned how to isolate them from the responsibilities of parenthood. When we talk about the unconventional theories of the younger generation we might in all honesty take this fact into account. They have had it demonstrated to them by their own parents, by those in whom the administering of the conventions is vested, that under certain circumstances it is legitimate and proper to gratify sexual desire apart from any obligation to the family or to the race. They have been taught that it is possible to do this, and that it may be proper. Therefore, the

older generation could no longer argue that sexual intercourse as such was evil. It could no longer argue that it was obviously dangerous. It could only maintain that the psychological consequences are serious if sexual gratification is not made incidental to the enduring partnership of marriage and a home. That may be, in fact, I think it can be shown to be, the real wisdom of the matter. Yet if it is the wisdom of the matter, it is a kind of wisdom which men and women can acquire by experience alone. They do not have it instinctively. They cannot be compelled to adopt it. They can only learn to believe it.

That is a very different thing from submitting to a convention upheld by all human and divine authority.

3. *The Logic of Birth Control*

With contraception established as a more or less legitimate idea in modern society, a vast discussion has ensued as to how the practice of it can be rationalized. In this discussion the pace is set by those who accept the apparent logic of contraception and are prepared boldly to revise the sexual conventions accordingly. They take as their major premise the obvious fact that by contraception it is possible to dissociate procreation from gratification, and therefore to pursue independently what Mr. Havelock Ellis calls the primary and secondary objects of the sexual impulse. They propose, therefore, to sanction two distinct sets of conventions: one designed to protect the interests of the offspring by promoting intelligent, secure, and cheerful parenthood; the other designed to permit the freest and fullest expression of the erotic personality. They propose, in other words, to distinguish between parenthood as a vocation involving public responsibility, and love as an art, pursued privately for the sake of happiness.

As a preparation for the vocation of parenthood it is pro-

posed to educate both men and women in the care, both physical and psychological, of children. It is proposed further that mating for parenthood shall become an altogether deliberate and voluntary choice: the argument here is that the duties of parenthood cannot be successfully fulfilled except where both parents cheerfully and knowingly assume them. Therefore, it is proposed, in order to avert the dangers of love at first sight and of mating under the blind compulsion of instinct, that a period of free experimentation be allowed to precede the solemn engagement to produce and rear children. This engagement is regarded as so much a public responsibility that it is even proposed, and to some extent has been embodied in the law of certain jurisdictions, that marriages for parenthood must be sanctioned by medical authority. In order, too, that no compulsive considerations may determine what ought to be a free and intelligent choice, it is argued that women should be economically independent before and during marriage. As this may not be possible for women without property of their own during the years when they are bearing and rearing children, it is proposed in some form or other to endow motherhood. This endowment may take the form of a legal claim upon the earnings of the father, or it may mean a subsidy from the state through mothers' pensions, free medical attention, day nurseries, and kindergartens. The principle that successful parenthood must be voluntary is maintained as consistently as possible. Therefore, among those who follow the logic of their idea, it is proposed that even marriages deliberately entered into for procreation shall be dissoluble at the will of either party, the state intervening only to insure the economic security of the offspring. It is proposed, furthermore, that where women find the vocation of motherhood impracticable for one reason or another, they may be relieved of the duty of rearing their children.

Not all of the advanced reformers adopt the whole of this program, but the whole of this program is logically inherent in the conception of parenthood as a vocation deliberately undertaken, publicly pursued, and motivated solely by the parental instincts.

The separate set of conventions which it is proposed to adopt for the development of love as an art have a logic of their own. Their function is not to protect the welfare of the child but the happiness of lovers. It is very easy to misunderstand this conception. Mr. Havelock Ellis, in fact, describes it as a "divine and elusive mystery," a description which threatens to provide a rather elusive standard by which to fix a new set of sexual conventions. But baffling as this sounds, it is not wholly inscrutable, and a sufficient understanding of what is meant can be attained by clearing up the dangerous ambiguity in the phrase "love as an art."

There are two arts of love and it makes a considerable difference which one is meant. There is the art of love as Casanova, for example, practiced it. It is the art of seduction, courtship, and sexual gratification: it is an art which culminates in the sexual act. It can be repeated with the same lover and with other lovers, but it exhausts itself in the moment of ecstasy. When that moment is reached, the work of art is done, and the lover as artist "after an interval, perhaps of stupor and vital recuperation" must start all over again, until at last the rhythm is so stale it is a weariness to start at all; or the lover must find new lovers and new resistances to conquer. The aftermath of romantic love—that is, of love that is consummated in sexual ecstasy—is either tedium in middle age or the compulsive adventurousness of the libertine.

Now this is not what Mr. Ellis means when he talks about love as an art. 'The act of intercourse," he says, "is only an incident and not as essential in love." Incident to

what? His answer is that it is an incident to an "exquisitely and variously and harmoniously blended" activity of "all the finer activities of the organism, physical and psychic." I take this to mean that when a man and woman are successfully in love, their whole activity is energized and victorious. They walk better, their digestion improves, they think more clearly, their secret worries drop away, the world is fresh and interesting, and they can do more than they dreamed that they could do. In love of this kind sexual intimacy is not the dead end of desire as it is in romantic or promiscuous love, but periodic affirmation of the inward delight of desire pervading an active life. Love of this sort can grow: it is not, like youth itself, a moment that comes and is gone and remains only a memory of something which cannot be recovered. It can grow because it has something to grow upon and to grow with; it is not contracted and stale because it has for its object, not the mere relief of physical tension, but all the objects with which the two lovers are concerned. They desire their worlds in each other, and therefore their love is as interesting as their worlds and their worlds are as interesting as their love.

It is to promote unions of this sort that the older liberals are proposing a new set of sexual conventions. There are, however, reformers in the field who take a much less exalted view of the sexual act, who regard it, indeed, not only as without biological or social significance, but also as without any very impressive psychological significance. "The practice of birth control," says Mr. C. E. M. Joad, for example, "will profoundly modify our sexual habits. It will enable the pleasures of sex to be tasted without its penalties, and it will remove the most formidable deterrent to irregular intercourse." For birth control "offers to the young . . . the prospect of shameless, harmless, and unlimited pleasure."

But whether the reformers agree with Mr. Ellis that sexual intimacy is, as he says, a sacrament signifying some great spiritual reality, or with Mr. Joad that it is a harmless pleasure, they are agreed that the sexual conventions should be revised to permit such unions without penalties and without any sense of shame.

They ask public opinion to sanction what contraception has made feasible. They point out that "a large number of the men and women of today form sexual relationships outside marriage—whether or not they ultimately lead to marriage—which they conceal or seek to conceal from the world." These relationships, says Mr. Ellis, differ from the extramarital manifestations of the sexual life of the past in that they do not derive from prostitution or seduction. Both of these ancient practices, he adds, are diminishing, for prostitution is becoming less attractive and, with the education of women, seduction is becoming less possible. The novelty of these new relations, the prevalence of which is conceded though it cannot be measured, lies in the fact that they are entered into voluntarily, have no obvious social consequences, and are altogether beyond the power of law or opinion to control. The argument, therefore, is that they should be approved, the chief point made being that by removing all stigma from such unions, they will become candid, wholesome, and delightful. The objection of the reformers to the existing conventions is that the sense of sin poisons the spontaneous goodness of such relationships.

The actual proposals go by a great variety of fancy names such as free love, trial marriage, companionate marriage. When these proposals are examined it is evident they all take birth control as their major premise, and then deduce from it some part or all of the logical consequences. Companionate marriage, for example, is from the point of view

of the law, whatever it may be subjectively, nothing but a somewhat roundabout way of saying that childless couples may be divorced by mutual consent. It is a proposal, if not to control, then at least to register, publicly, all sexual unions, the theory being that this public registration will abolish shame and furtiveness and give them a certain permanence. Companionate marriage is frankly an attempt at a compromise between marriages that are difficult to dissolve and clandestine relationships which have no sanction whatever.

The uncompromising logic of birth control has been stated more clearly, I think, by Mr. Bertrand Russell than by anyone else. Writing to Judge Lindsey during the uproar about companionate marriage, Mr. Russell said:

> I go further than you do: the things which your enemies say about you would be largely true of me. My own view is that the state and the law should take no notice of sexual relations apart from children, and that no marriage ceremony should be valid unless accompanied by a medical certificate of the woman's pregnancy. But when once there are children, I think that divorce should be avoided except for very grave cause. I should not regard physical infidelity as a very grave cause and should teach people that it is to be expected and tolerated, but should not involve the begetting of illegitmate children—not because illegitimacy is bad in itself, but because a home with two parents is best for children. I do not feel that the main thing in marriage is the feeling of the parents for each other; the main thing is cooperation in bearing children.

In this admirably clear statement there is set forth a plan for that complete separation between the primary and secondary function of sexual intercourse which contraception makes possible.

4. *The Use of Convention*

It is one thing, however, to recognize the full logic of birth control and quite another thing to say that convention ought to be determined by that logic. One might as well argue that because automobiles can be driven at a hundred miles an hour the laws should sanction driving at the rate of a hundred miles an hour. Birth control is a device like the automobile, and its inherent possibilities do not fix the best uses to be made of it.

What an understanding of the logic of birth control does is to set before us the limits of coercive control of sexual relations. The law can, for example, make divorce very difficult where there are children. It could, as Mr. Bertrand Russell suggests, refuse divorce on the ground of infidelity. On the other hand the law cannot effectively prohibit infidelity, and as a matter of fact does not do so today. It cannot effectively prohibit fornication though there are statutes against it. Therefore, what Mr. Russell has done is to describe accurately enough the actual limits of effective legal control.

But sexual conventions are not statutes, and it is important to define quite clearly just what they are. In the older world they were rules of conduct enforceable by the family and the community through habit, coercion, and authority. In this sense of the word, convention tends to lose force and effect in modern civilization. Yet a convention is essentially a theory of conduct and all human conduct implies some theory of conduct. Therefore, although it may be that no convention is any longer coercive, conventions remain, are adopted, revised, and debated. They embody the considered results of experience: perhaps the experience of a lonely pioneer or perhaps the collective experience of the dominant members of a community. In any event they are as

necessary to a society which recognizes no authority as to one which does. For the inexperienced must be offered some kind of hypothesis when they are confronted with the necessity of making choices: they cannot be so utterly open-minded that they stand inert until something collides with them. In the modern world, therefore, the function of conventions is to declare the meaning of experience. A good convention is one which will most probably show the inexperienced the way to happy experience.

Just because the rule of sexual conduct by authority is dissolving, the need of conventions which will guide conduct is increasing. That, in fact, is the reason for the immense and urgent discussion of sex throughout the modern world. It is an attempt to attain an understanding of the bewilderingly new experiences to which few men or women know how to adjust themselves. The true business of the moralist in the midst of all this is not to denounce this and to advocate that, but to see as clearly as he can into the meaning of it, so that out of the chaos of pain and happiness and worry he may help to deliver a usable insight.

It is, I think, to the separation of parenthood as a vocation, from love as an end in itself, that the moralist must address himself. For this is the heart of the problem: to determine whether this separation, which birth control has made feasible and which law can no longer prevent, is in harmony with the conditions of human happiness.

5. *The New Hedonism*

Among those who hold that the separation of the primary and secondary functions of the sexual impulse is good and should constitute the major premise of modern sexual conventions, there are, as I have already pointed out, two schools of thought. There are the trancendentalists who believe with Mr. Havelock Ellis that "sexual pleasure,

wisely used and not abused, may prove the stimulus, and liberator of our finest and most exalted activities," and there are the unpretentious hedonists who believe that sexual pleasure is pleasure and not the stimulus or liberator of anything important. Both are, as we say, emancipated: neither recognizes the legitimacy of objective control unless a child is born, and both reject as an evil the traditional subjective control exercised by the sense of sin. Where they differ is in their valuation of love.

Hedonism as an attitude toward life is, of course, not a new thing in the world, but it has never before been tested out under such favorable conditions. To be a successful hedonist a man must have the opportunity to seek his pleasures without fear of any kind. Theodorus of Cyrene, who taught about 310 B.C., saw that clearly, and therefore to release men from fear openly denied the Olympian gods. But the newest hedonism has had an even better prospect than the classical: it finds men emancipated not only of all fear of divine authority and human custom but of physical and social consequences as well. If the pursuit of pleasure by carefree men were the way to happiness, hedonism ought, then, to be proving itself triumphantly in the modern world. Possibly it is too early to judge, but the fact is nevertheless highly significant, I think, that the new hedonists should already have arrived at the same conclusion as the later hedonists in the classical world. Hegesias, for example, wrote when hedonism had already had a great vogue: he was called, rather significantly, the "persuader to die." For having started from the premise that pleasure is the end of life, he concluded that, since life affords at least as much pain as pleasure, the end of life cannot be realized. There is now a generation in the world which is approaching middle age. They have exercised the privileges which were won by the iconoclasts who attacked what was usually

called the Puritan or Victorian tradition. They have exercised the privileges without external restraint and without inhibition. Their conclusions are reported in the latest works of fiction. Do they report that they have found happiness in their freedom? Well, hardly. Instead of the gladness which they were promised, they seem, like Hegesias, to have found the wasteland.

> If love has come to be less often a sin [says that very discerning critic of life and letters, Mr. Joseph Wood Krutch] it has come also to be less often a supreme privilege. If one turns to the smarter of those novelists who describe the doings of the more advanced set of those who are experimenting with life—to, for example, Mr. Aldous Huxley or Mr. Ernest Hemingway,—one will discover in their tragic farces the picture of a society which is at bottom in despair because, though it is more completely absorbed in the pursuit of love than in anything else, it has lost the sense of any ultimate importance inherent in the experience which preoccupies it; and if one turns to the graver of the intellectual writers,—to, for example, Mr. D. H. Lawrence, Mr. T. S. Eliot, or Mr. James Joyce,—one will find both explicitly and implicitly a similar sense that the transcendental value of love has become somehow attenuated, and that, to take a perfectly concrete example, a conclusion which does no more than bring a man and woman into complete possession of one another is a mere bathos which does nothing except legitimately provoke the comment, "Well, what of it?" One can hardly imagine them concerned with what used to be called, in a phrase which they have helped to make faintly ridiculous, "the right to love." Individual freedom they have inherited and assumed as a

right, but they are concerned with something which their more restricted forefathers assumed—with, that is to say, the value of love itself. No inhibitions either within or without restrain them, but they are asking themselves, "What is it worth?" and they are certainly no longer feeling that it is obviously and in itself something which makes life worth the living.

To Huxley and Hemingway—I take them as the most conspicuous exemplars of a whole school—love is at times only a sort of obscene joke. The former in particular has delighted to mock sentiment with physiology, to place the emotions of the lover in comic juxaposition with quaint biological lore, and to picture a romantic pair "quietly sweating palm to palm." But the joke is one which turns quickly bitter upon the tongue, for a great and gratifying illusion has passed away, leaving the need for it still there. His characters still feel the psychological urge, and, since they have no sense of sin in connection with it, they yield easily and continually to that urge; but they have also the human need to respect their chief preoccupation, and it is the capacity to do this that they have lost. Absorbed in the pursuit of sexual satisfaction, they never find love and they are scarcely aware that they are seeking it, but they are far from content with themselves. In a generally devaluated world they are eagerly endeavoring to get what they can in the pursuit of satisfactions which are sufficiently instinctive to retain inevitably a modicum of animal pleasure, but they cannot transmute that simple animal pleasure into anything else. They themselves not infrequently share the contempt with which their creator regards them, and nothing could be less seductive, because nothing could be less glamorous, than the description of the debaucheries

> born of nothing except a sense of the emptiness of life.

This "generally devaluated world," of which Mr. Krutch speaks, what is it after all, but a world in which nothing connects itself very much with anything else? If you start with the belief that love is the pleasure of a moment, is it really surprising that it yields only a momentary pleasure? For it is the most ironical of all illusions to suppose that one is free of illusions in contracting any human desire to its primary physiological satisfaction. Does a man dine well because he ingests the requisite number of calories? Is he freer from illusions about his appetite than the man who creates an interesting dinner party out of the underlying fact that his guests and he have the need to fill their stomachs? Would it really be a mark of enlightenment if each of them filled his stomach in the solitary and solemn conviction that good conversation and pleasant companionship are one thing and nutrition is another?

This much the transcendentalists understand well enough. They do not wish to isolate the satisfaction of desire from our "finest and most exalted activities." They would make it "the stimulus and the liberator" of these activities. They would use it to arouse to "wholesome activity all the complex and interrelated systems of the organism." But what are these finest and most exalted activities which are to be stimulated and liberated? The discovery of truth, the making of works of art, meditation and insight? Mr. Ellis does not specify. If these are the activities that are meant, then the discussion applies to a very few of the men and women on earth. For the activities of most of them are necessarily concerned with earning a living and managing a household and rearing children and finding recreation. If the art of love is to stimulate and liberate activities, it is these prosaic

activities which it must stimulate and liberate. But if you idealize the logic of birth control, make parenthood a separate vocation, isolate love from work and the hard realities of living, and say that it must be spontaneous and carefree, what have you done? You have separated it from all the important activities which it might stimulate and liberate. You have made love spontaneous but empty, and you have made home-building and parenthood efficient, responsible, and dull.

What has happened, I believe, is what so often happens in the first enthusiasm for a revolutionary invention. Its possibilities are so dazzling that men forget that inventions belong to man and not man to his inventions. In the discussion which has ensued since birth control became generally feasible, the central confusion has been that the reformers have tried to fix their sexual ideals in accordance with the logic of birth control instead of the logic of human nature. Birth control does make feasible this dissociation of interests which were once organically united. There are undoubtedly the best of reasons for dissociating them up to a point. But how completely it is wise to dissociate them is a matter to be determined not by saying how completely it is possible to dissociate them, but how much it is desirable to dissociate them.

All the varieties of the modern doctrine that man is a collection of separate impulses, each of which can attain its private satisfaction, are in fundamental contradiction not only with the traditional body of human wisdom but with the modern conception of the human character. Thus in one breath it is said in advanced circles that love is a series of casual episodes, and in the next it transpires that the speaker is in process of having himself elaborately psychoanalyzed in order to disengage his soul from the effects of apparently trivial episodes in his childhood. On the one

hand it is asserted that sex prevades everything and on the other that sexual behavior is inconsequential. It is taught that experience is cumulative, that we are what our past has made us and shall be what we are making of ourselves now, and then with bland indifference to the significance of this we are told that all experiences are free, equal, and independent.

6. *Marriage and Affinity*

It is not hard to see why those who are concerned in revising sexual conventions should have taken the logic of birth control rather than knowledge of human nature as their major premise. Birth control in an immensely beneficent invention which can and does relieve men and women of some of the most tragic sorrows which afflict them: the tragedies of the unwanted child, the tragedies of insupportable economic burdens, the tragedies of excessive childbearing and the destruction of youth and the necessity of living in an unrelenting series of pregnancies. It offers them freedom from intolerable mismating, from sterile virtue, from withering denials of happiness. These are the facts which the reformers saw, and in birth control they saw the instrument by which such freedom could be obtained.

The sexual conventions which they have proposed are really designed to cure notorious evils. They do not define the good life in sex; they point out ways of escape from the bad life. Thus companionate marriage is proposed by Judge Lindsey not as a type of union which is inherently desirable, but as an avenue of escape from corrupt marriages on the one hand and furtive promiscuity on the other. The movement for free divorce comes down to this: it is necessary because so many marriages are a failure. The whole theory that love is separate from parenthood and home-building is supported by the evidence in those cases where married

couples are not lovers. It is the pathology of sexual relations which inspires the reformers of sexual conventions.

There is no need to quarrel with them because they insist upon remedies for manifest evils. Deep confusion results when they forget that these remedies are only remedies, and go on to institute them as ideals. It is better, without any doubt, that incompatible couples should be divorced and that each should then be free to find a mate who is compatible. But the frequency with which men and women have to resort to divorce because they are incompatible will be greatly influenced by the notions they have before and during marriage of what compatibility is, and what it involves. The remedies for failure are important. But what is central is the conception of sexual relations by which they expect to live successfully.

They cannot—I am, of course, speaking broadly—expect to live successfully by the conception that the primary and secondary functions of sex are in separate compartments of the soul. I have indicated why this conception is self-defeating and why, since human nature is organic and experience cumulative, our activities must, so to speak, engage and imply each other. Mates who are not lovers will not really coöperate, as Mr. Bertrand Russell thinks they should, in bearing children; they will be distracted, insufficient, and worst of all they will be merely dutiful. Lovers who have nothing to do but love each other are not really to be envied; love and nothing else very soon is nothing else. The emotion of love, in spite of the romantics, is not self-sustaining; it endures only when the lovers love many things together, and not merely each other. It is this understanding that love cannot successfully be isolated from the business of living which is the enduring wisdom of the institution of marriage. Let the law be what it may be as to what constitutes a marriage contract and how and

when it may be dissolved. Let public opinion be as tolerant as it can be toward any and every kind of irregular and experimental relationship. When all the criticisms have been made, when all supernatural sanctions have been discarded, all subjective inhibitions erased, all compulsions abolished, the convention of marriage still remains to be considered as an interpretation of human experience. It is by the test of how genuinely it interprets human experience that the convention of marriage will ultimately be judged.

The wisdom of marriage rests upon an extremely unsentimental view of lovers and their passions. Its assumptions, when they are frankly exposed, are horrifying to those who have been brought up in the popular romantic tradition of the nineteenth century. These assumptions are that, given an initial attraction, a common social background, common responsibilities, and the conviction that the relationship is permanent, compatibility in marriage can normally be achieved. It is precisely this that the prevailing sentimentality about love denies. It assumes that marriages are made in heaven, that compatibility is instinctive, a mere coincidence, that happy unions are, in the last analysis, lucky accidents in which two people who happen to suit each other happen to have met. The convention of marriage rests on an interpretation of human nature which does not confuse the subjective feeling of the lovers that their passion is unique, with the brutal but objective fact that, had they never met, each of them would in all probability have found a lover who was just as unique.

> Love [says Mr. Santayana] is indeed much less exacting than it thinks itself. Nine-tenths of its cause are in the lover, for one-tenth that may be in the object. Were the latter not accidentally at hand, an almost identical passion would probably have been felt for some one

> else; for, although with acquaintance the quality of an attachment naturally adapts itself to the person loved, and makes that person its standard and ideal, the first assault and mysterious glow of the passion is much the same for every object.

This is the reason why the popular conception of romantic love as the meeting of two affinities produces so much unhappiness. The mysterious glow of passion is accepted as a sign that the great coincidence has occurred; there is a wedding and soon, as the glow of passion cools, it is discovered that no instinctive and preordained affinity is present. At this point the wisdom of popular romantic marriage is exhausted. For it proceeds on the assumption that love is a mysterious visitation. There is nothing left, then, but to grin and bear a miserably dull and nagging fate, or to break off and try again. The deep fallacy of the conception is in the failure to realize that compatibility is a process and not an accident, that it depends upon the maturing of instinctive desire by adaptation to the whole nature of the other person and to the common concerns of the pair of lovers.

The romantic theory of affinities rests upon an immature theory of desire. It springs from an infantile belief that the success of love is in the satisfactions which the other person provides. What this really means is that in childlike fashion the lover expects his mistress to supply him with happiness. But in the adult world that expectation is false. Because nine-tenths of the cause, as Mr. Santayana says, are in the lover for one-tenth that may be in the object, it is what the lover does about that nine-tenths which is decisive for his happiness. It is the claim, therefore, of those who uphold the ideal of marriage as a full partnership, and reject the ideal which would separate love as an

art from parenthood as a vocation, that in the home made by a couple who propose to see it through, there are provided the essential conditions under which the passions of men and women are most likely to become mature, and therefore harmonious and disinterested.

7. *The Schooling of Desire*

They need not deny, indeed it would be foolish as well as cruel for them to underestimate, the enormous difficulty of achieving successful marriages under modern conditions. For with the dissolution of authority and compulsion, a successful marriage depends wholly upon the capacity of the man and woman to make it successful. They have to accomplish wholly by understanding and sympathy and disinterestedness of purpose what was once in a very large measure achieved by habit, necessity, and the absence of any practicable alternative. It takes two persons to make a successful marriage in the modern world, and that fact more than doubles its difficulty. For these reasons alone the modern state ought to do what it would none the less be compelled to do: it ought to provide decent ways of retreat in case of failure.

But if it is the truth that the convention of marriage correctly interprets human experience, whereas the separatist conventions are self-defeating, then the convention of marriage will prove to be the conclusion which emerges out of all this immense experimenting. It will survive not as a rule of law imposed by force, for that is now, I think, become impossible. It will not survive as a moral commandment with which the elderly can threaten the young. They will not listen. It will survive as the dominant insight into the reality of love and happiness, or it will not survive at all. That does not mean that all persons will live under the convention of marriage. As a matter of fact in civilized

ages all persons never have. It means that the convention of marriage, when it is clarified by insight into reality, is likely to be the hypothesis upon which men and women will ordinarily proceed. There will be no compulsion behind it except the compulsion in each man and woman to reach a true adjustment of his life.

It is in this necessity of clarifying their love for those who are closest to them that the moral problems of the new age come to a personal issue. It is in the realm of sexual relations that mankind is being schooled amidst pain and worry for the novel conditions which modernity imposes. It is there, rather than in politics, business, or even in religion, that the issues are urgent, vivid, and inescapable. It is there that they touch most poignantly and most radically the organic roots of human personality. And it is there, in the ordering of their personal attachments, that for most men the process of salvation must necessarily begin.

For disinterestedness in all things, as Dean Inge says, is a mountain track which the many are likely in the future as in the past to find cold, bleak, and bare: that is why "the road of ascent is by personal affection for man." By the happy ordering of their personal affections they may establish the type and the quality and the direction of their desires for all things. It is in the hidden issues between lovers, more than anywhere else, that modern men and women are compelled, by personal anguish rather than by laws and preachments or even by the persuasions of abstract philosophy, to transcend naïve desire and to reach out toward a mature and disinterested partnership with their world.

THE HUSBAND *

E. R. GROVES and W. F. OGBURN

Professor Ernest Rutherford Groves has since 1927 been a member of the Faculty of the University of North Carolina, as Professor of Sociology. He is a member of the American Sociological Society and the Trinity Society of London; also the American Anthropological Society. He graduated from Dartmouth with Phi Beta Kappa honors, and from Yale Divinity School. There is hardly a conference of note on modern social problems where he is not called in as a speaker or quoted by those who make the keynote addresses. In conjunction with Professor Ogburn of the University of Chicago, he has produced one of the outstanding books in the Science of Human Nature, *American Marriage and Family Relationships.* Previous to his joining the Faculty of the University of North Carolina, he was Professor of Sociology at the University of New Hampshire and also Dean of the Arts College. He was Professor of Sociology at Boston University and Instructor in English at Dartmouth.

Some of his well-known publications are as follows: *Moral Sanitation; Using the Resources of the Country Church; Rural Problems of Today; The Rural Mind and Social Welfare; Personality and Social Adjustment; Social Problems and Education* (with wife); *Wholesome Childhood; Social Problems of the Family* (with wife); *Wholesome Marriage; The Marriage Crisis; Introduction to Sociology; Wholesome Parenthood; The Drifting Home; Parents and Children* (with wife).

In the same year that Professor Groves went to the University of North Carolina, Professor William Fielding Ogburn was called to the professorship of Sociology at the University of Chicago. He has had a distinguished academic career, being a graduate from Mercer University, Georgia, and receiving his M.A. from Columbia in 1909 and his Ph.D. in 1912. He was instructor in Economics and Politics and History at Princeton from 1911 to 1912; Professor of Sociology and Economics at Reed College, Portland, 1912-1917; Professor of Sociology at the University of Washington, 1917 to 1918; examiner and head of Cost of Living Department, National War Labor Board, 1918-1919; special agent United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1919; Professor of Sociology at Columbia University, 1919-1927. He was editor of the *Journal of American Statistics* from the year 1920 to 1926. He is a member of the American Sociological Society, American Economic Association, Fellow of the

---

* This chapter is taken from Ogburn and Groves, *American Marriage and Family Relationships,* published by Henry Holt, New York, 1929, and reprinted with their kind permission.

American Statistical Association and the American Ethnological Society and the American Anthropological Society.

In 1912 he wrote *Progress and Uniformity in Child Labor Legislation; Social Change* in 1922; *The Social Sciences* in 1927. Also various articles on sociological, economic, and statistical subjects. He is in wide demand also as a lecturer.

Rôle of the Husband

THAT the modern wife has a more difficult problem than her mother is generally recognized, but that the husband's rôle as compared with that of his father has also become more difficult is often forgotten. This statement does not mean merely that his responsibilities as producer of the family income have increased, but rather that the man, looked at strictly from the husband rôle, has a more complicated and delicate task than have husbands in the past. Not only do women demand more of life, they also demand more of their husbands. The husband-wife relationship has itself become more complex, and it is easier for the husband at some points to fail and by his failure to wreck the family happiness.

It is obvious that innumerable men let down as soon as they are married and attempt to maintain an easy-going routine. This policy is, however, in our time more likely than ever before to be disastrous as a larger number of wives become insistent that their husbands continue in the spirit of courtship chivalry the attitudes that were characteristic before the marriage. This forces the man to think less of rights and more of duties and opportunities. The marriage does not represent the means by which the man securely possesses the woman, but rather a continuation of the testing which he underwent before the wedding ceremony. As a consequence a considerable proportion of those men who fail to maintain a progressive relationship finds that their letting down leads to the disappointment or restlessness of the wife and in some cases to the complete loss of her

affection. The husband's failure is perhaps too often charged to selfishness or careless indifference. The disaster is in many cases the result of discordant attitudes that have become attached to the rôle of the husband.

Not only must he play his part in a manner that will permit him to keep his wife's respect, but he also has ideals of his own, which he feels bound to approximate. It is here that tension easily comes about. The rôle of the husband, from his own viewpoint, issues out of childhood experience and has at least an element of confidence in masculine superiority. Running through his previous social experience has been a history of greater privileges and larger opportunities than those given girls. However advanced the home life of his parents, it has usually been standardized according to the traditions which in the past have afforded to men social superiority. These early experiences and a multitude of suggestions from various quarters have led him to take too seriously the authority and responsibility that belong to him as a husband.

Passing of Masculine Authority

Even though the courtship has been entirely modern and the girl has been the antithesis of the clinging vine type of her mother's days, it is rare for the man entering matrimony to understand how archaic and impossible the conventional thoughts of men with reference to their headship of the family have become. Delighted with the modernity of his fiancée, the lover had not realized that the girl who could be his companion on rough walks, who enjoyed discussing the man's world in which he was interesting, and who was a thoroughly good sport when faced with difficulties, was bound to continue in the maturity of married life the independent ways he had found so fascinating in his sweetheart.

Just as older relatives are enchanted by the infant's first

displays of aggressiveness and chuckle when he is so advanced as to pull their hair or march off with their treasures, but grow impatient of his bothersomeness as he approaches the more effective freedom of action characteristic of the runabout, so the unthinking bridegroom of a modern girl may find his response to the courageous strength shown by his sweetheart changing from laughing admiration to real annoyance as the honeymoon period shades into the routine of daily life. It had not occurred to him that marriage would not "tame" the girl he had chosen, as he understood it had metamorphosed into housebound wives the turbulent belles of the 'forties. That the man and his new wife have contradictory ideas of the rôle of the modern wife is an unsuspected fact to both members of the alliance before its consummation, for the incompatibility of the old and the new attitude is seldom felt until marriage has actually been established.

It would be a false interpretation to suppose that the husband's difficulty comes from his desire to exploit his wife or to force upon her the narrowness of life which she desires to escape, but the fact is that the man has a sense of pride in assuming the responsibilities which in the past as a matter of course have been his. The husband takes it for granted that the new home has to have a leader and that it falls upon him, in accord with the social practices to which he has been accustomed, to direct the new relationship. Perhaps his wife also takes this arrangement for granted in the abstract, although in practice it soon appears in the largest proportion of modern homes that this authoritative rôle of the male is impossible to carry out.

Democratic Family

This does not mean that most of our marriages are at present committed to a democratic—or what some have

called an equality—family program. Those who have deeply felt the changes that are taking place, and who are in harmony with the higher type of family, by their very effort to establish a democratic household escape most of the tension that has now become so characteristic of the early days of American marriage. The great majority of men and women are not consistent, either in their thinking or in their practices. As a rule their ideas are in closer agreement than their behavior. The woman is not worried lest her husband's ideal fail to coincide with hers, for she seldom realizes how great a difference there is between them in their thinking. She merely demands in her experiences what he finds it hard to grant, without modifying the basic thought with which he views marriage. In theory they may both agree although often they do not, but in their practices serious differences are revealed.

The situation that arises is frequently most puzzling to the man. Wishing to make his wife happy, he takes over the task of managing the new home, which in a subtle manner suggests that upon him now devolves what is essentially a protectorship. Not only is this rôle foreign to her conception of what belongs to the husband, but it arouses her resentment. She is shocked and surprised because she had assumed that the whole matter had already been settled. The spirit of their fellowship before marriage had deceived her into thinking her lover entirely devoid of the masculine attitude of superiority which she had encountered with more forceful expression in other men.

Tradition of Masculine Superiority

The mischief comes about primarily because even yet the rôle of husband, as it appears in the social thought of our time, assumes as its basis the power of authority and of superiority that for so long has been given to man as the head of

the house. With the coming of the new woman there has not been a corresponding reconstruction of the rôle of husband in the degree necessary to bring into accord the man and woman.

The New Woman

It might at first seem that only a small number of women, belonging to the group of the educated and well-to-do, are afflicted with a point of view so divergent from that of their husbands as to cause trouble. The movement, however, has been too fundamental to be restricted to any class. Found as it is in larger proportion among the educated, it nevertheless runs all through social experience and only extremely isolated and traditional women are entirely devoid of protest when they find themselves assigned a secondary rôle in the family enterprise.

The situation has not resulted from agitation or any deliberate effort on the part of women to make marriage a more reasonable partnership. It is the product of social conditions outside the home that have operated upon the woman more than upon the man and made her insistent upon privileges for which her mother and grandmother would not even have dared to ask, had there been any inclination on their part to break away from the conventions that were so firmly fixed. Woman, by living a freer and more self-expressing life in ordinary occupations, has naturally as a result of the habit and experiences of earning a living or getting an education come to demand, after marriage as before, a larger scope for her special abilities and a more just distribution of opportunities.

The changes in woman's experience have been rapid and profound; man's have been chiefly secondary results of the increasing freedom that women have assumed. It is women, therefore, rather than men who notice the difference between

the present and the past and are insistent in their demand that marriage shall not be the means by which they are forced back to greater subserviency.

Clash of Husband and Wife

If the point of clash becomes conscious so that both husband and wife fully realize their basic difference in life attitude, a crisis may arise which will lead either to eventual understanding and compromise or a drifting apart, which, even though it does not end in separation, produces serious division and unhappiness. More commonly such radical differences do not appear, but instead a series of tugs start in opposite directions through the desire of each member of the matrimonial partnership to steer the family in the direction that seems to him or her desirable. As a consequence of this there is a series of conflicts and settlements, out of which either equilibrium finally arrives or a rift which forces the two farther and farther apart.

There are two classes of men in their reactions to the demands of the modernized wife. In one class are found the husbands who desire to force women to keep the place that has so long been assigned them. The other group are eager to help their wives in every way to find the opportunities they desire. It would be contrary to fact to charge the first group with a selfish disregard of the rights claimed by their wives. The trouble is not so much their disposition as their lack of understanding. Even though to some extent they are victims of rationalizing processes, most of them are sincere in supposing that the program they insist upon is the normal and wise course for the family to pursue. They are rather creatures of habit than persons eager to exploit.

Whenever social change moves rapidly, this risk that habit fall behind the need becomes great, and is especially mischievous in problems of association. Nowhere are the dan-

gers of retardation greater than in the intimacies of the family, since the home offers an arena where differences of opinion are expressed freely, untempered by the restraint which even the most extreme opinions are likely to receive through prudence in other walks of life.

Practical Problems of Home-making

The more liberal and modern husband, who is eager to help his wife find her allotted place in the new scheme of things, does not by his sympathy save himself from a difficult problem. Concrete questions constantly arise, and problems of family policy that call for judgment are frequent. Unless the home is of the apartment type with practically no housekeeping or household responsibilities of any sort, it soon appears that the husband, whatever he may choose for his wife, cannot prevent her having greater obligations for the maintenance of family life than he himself has. He may even go so far as to sacrifice his own interests and inclinations in order to help his wife find outlets for her desires. This results, for example, when the woman's career makes it necessary for her to have her residence in a definite locality while the man would find it to his advantage to move elsewhere. Although he chooses the lesser opportunity, that she may have a chance to develop her vocational or professional interest, time reveals that not even so great a sacrifice on his part can give her the complete detachment she needs, unless the family life be reduced to such terms as to make it deficient in its yield of satisfaction.

Moreover, the husband who faces his problem without bias in many cases is forced to conclude that his wife's eagerness to find an outlet is not based upon any adequate ability or talent which can possibly furnish the success she expects. He is then bound to recognize that any sacrifice he is making in the progress of his own career, in order to give his wife

a more effective chance to try her powers, is, from the point of view of the family welfare, a mistake, leading in the long run to consequences that will disappoint the wife more than if she were hampered in her inclinations to achieve by herself.

Man Has the Advantage

However honest and penetrating the man may be, if he is of a generous nature, eager to maintain a democratic type of family, he becomes suspicious of his own motives when he finds that his thinking is leading him toward a greater opportunity for his own achievement at the expense of his wife's freedom. Even when he is so sure of himself that he courageously tries to maintain a policy that he is convinced will prove to be best for the future content of the family, it is nearly impossible for him at first to carry out his program without leading his wife to feel that he is selfish and eager to advance himself at her expense.

In other words, as society is still organized, family prosperity can be promoted more rapidly if the resources of the male be used to their fullness, rather than giving to the wife the greatest possible freedom without any regard for the effect this may have upon the husband's career. This is, of course, not true where women are extraordinarily gifted, but such wives are usually able to find, with or without the husband's help, the necessary outlet for their talent. Tension is more likely to occur in a family where the wife's talents are not above the average, while her ambition and self-confidence drive her forward to expect a distinction which, even when she is reinforced by her husband's assistance, seldom can come.

The Ambitions of Woman

In the past the social conventions have discouraged women from making use of their natural ability, and this has

resulted in a lessening of ambition; but in our time it must not be forgotten that the trend is the opposite, and now women who are responding to the new conditions are easily infected with a social contagion which drives them after distinction and makes them resentful of household routine. Although their gifts are not such as to justify their expectations of success in business or in the professions, their happiness could be found in the management of the family, if only they were willing to make an undivided commitment to their household responsibilities. To them it appears criticism to suggest that they refrain from any aggressive effort to achieve outside the family. They interpret this as the willfulness of masculine dominance, and their resentment adds all the more to the push of their ambition. Their inevitable defeat is interpreted as the result of the coercion and limitation imposed upon them by the family attitude.

Although the great majority of modern women do not fall in this group, there are enough such to form in any community a sizable problem of family disorganization. The policy they maintain of pushing forward even at the sacrifice of marriage and family responsibilities explains a type of family conflicts out of which issue a portion of our divorces.

The husband sensitive to his wife's feelings is troubled by her dissatisfactions that come out of the difficulty of adjustment between family ties and personal self-expression. He recognizes that the social conventions provide him with a superior opportunity—indeed with an unfair advantage. If he realizes that it is the wife's obligations as a mother that are defeating, or at least hampering, the self-expression she craves, he is perplexed as well as troubled, since he has to face the fact that nothing he can do except sharing in child care at the expense of his own career will in any great measure release her from the demands put upon her by the

little child, unless they both farm out their parenthood responsibilities and achieve at the expense of the child.

Modern Husband's Rôle Difficult

The rôle of the husband is not difficult merely because of the tension, which is comparatively recent, resulting from the desire of the wife to have a freer career than women in the past have either expected or been permitted. There are other points where trouble for the modern husband arises.

One of these is the greater demand put upon him in his sex life. This is not always valued by observers of the modern family according to its importance. In the recent past in America the sex demands of women have been negligible, but that is no longer true. At no point has what we may justly call emancipation been more significant. On the other hand, many men thoroughly in accord with the democratic trend of the home are not conscious of the new testing they are receiving along lines of sex, nor are they prepared to make the contribution required of them. Their failure changes sex from an asset to a family liability. Once it was sufficient for the family relationship to prove satisfactory to the male. In our time both husband and wife are increasingly conscious of the demands each lays upon the other.

Those who think of the problem of the man as consisting in the need of familiarity with sex experience, and who therefore advocate his training by prostitution or some modified substitute for it, do not apprehend the real nature of the problem. He who has been trained merely to regard his own desires by the commercializing of his sex instinct finds himself utterly unprepared and baffled by the requirement of the modern wife who insists that sex relationships should not be for her a duty, the fulfillment of the legal right of the husband, but a personal satisfaction.

The distance between the two is frequently so great that the husband has no appreciation whatever of an increasing protest and eventual revolt on his wife's part. At no point can preparation for marriage prove of greater advantage to men than in teaching the husband the necessity of his understanding not only his own needs, but those of the particular woman to whom he is married. The problem is essentially a psychic one, in most instances, for the failure of the man is usually his turning of sex into something merely physical and by the process making it for the wife an experience detached from the general flow of her life and dissatisfying because of its simplicity and physical crudeness.

Limitations of Sex

In spite of the strength of the sex instinct, human experience is disclosing clearly that, however powerful these impulses are, they do not prepare for a satisfactory human relationship between men and women living on a high level of culture. Although ignorance is danger, there is an even greater hazard in perversion, and the influence of prostitution is distinctly perverting. Fortunately, in the new order for men, a specific and sensible use of sex knowledge goes a long way in equipping the husband to play his difficult rôle so as to stabilize the affection in which marriage starts.

Rôle of Husband More Complex

It is evident that the general trend is to make the position of the husband more complex than it has been in the past. It is true that from the point of view of power his authority has diminished, but when the significance of his part is considered, more responsibility falls upon him than ever before. It is in the quality of his contracts in the family that the great change appears. He cannot any longer enjoy a satisfying family life if he attempts to limit himself to the getting

of an income and the administration of power within the home. He has to make a personal investment in the more subtle aspects of the family or it soon shows a destitution which leads to barrenness and discontent.

Economic Competition

It is questionable whether there has been any lessening of competitive pressure put upon him in his occupation to permit him to have time and inclination to contribute to the family what it needs from him. It is here that the seriousness of the break in our cultural routine shows most definitely. In the rural homestead there was no serious conflict between the economic support of the family and its social maintenance. When production was carried outside the family and organized by itself, it was inevitable that its development should reach the place where its interests were often in discord with the demands of the family.

The conscientious husband and father, who wishes to do what is right and wise for his family must in these days face the problem of distribution of interests. If he invests too much of himself in economic competition and cannot give to the family what it needs, his failure may lead to his wife's giving too much, so that the family becomes effeminate from the inability of the father to do his part. On the other hand, if the husband becomes too concerned with the family, he soon ceases to make headway in the fierce rivalries of business or the professions.

Recently an industrial expert declared that the employer of labor would always prefer a workman who had one or two children over one who had many. In so far as this is a true picture of the employer's attitude, it discloses the risk any man runs who assumes too much of a burden of family obligation, whether because of the quantitative responsibilities of many children or his qualitative

response to the demands put upon him by his family. It is true that family obligations act as hostages of fortune, preventing rapid removals and radical demands on the part of working people. But these conserving influences are more than offset, from the point of view of the employer, when the worker cannot concentrate on the task given him because of his worry concerning his family, or when he fails to regard his business as his primary purpose in living.

The influence of the city upon the equipment of the home has been such as to reduce to small proportions what the family can undertake together. In so far as the home has been squeezed out of existence, the task of the husband has been correspondingly increased. This would not be true, even if the family functioned very little in the home, if its outside activities were the common experience of all the members of the family. The division of interest has led to a separation in recreation and out-of-the-home undertakings that provides little basis for mutual understanding. The result is that the husband has less opportunity than he should have to influence the association, although the family, if it is to flourish, needs more than ever the husband's and father's contribution.

The predicament in which many city families find themselves is not inherently necessary, since the increase of leisure could be used largely to offset the lessening of household activities. The trouble comes from the more rapid development of individual interests than of leisure, under modern conditions of industry.

Appreciation of Values

The American family, especially in the city, does not at present call for any enormous amount of time to be given it by the husband. It does, however, increasingly require an apprehension of its values, and the father who adequately

interprets life to the family easily fulfills the rôle now demanded of him. So far as the régime of the past is continued and the man estimates his task as providing for the family through his earnings, or assuming government in the spirit of masculine superiority, he misplays his rôle and the hazard of the family is increased.

Some of the critics of the modern family forget how fine and satisfying a family life can be maintained with little home association. The family and the home are not synonymous. The home experiences portray only a part of the family function. Once the family had to live most of its life within the home. It is easy to see in present conditions the decay of the family if one forgets that home contacts do not fully measure family life. In so far as the various members of the family have common interests, even though these are expressed in activities outside the home, they are continuing the family enterprise and are not mere individuals unrelated by ties of sympathy.

Shrinking Family Activity

It is hopeless to ask the family today to maintain the quantity of home life which was once feasible. With reference to this there cannot be any standard home because of variations of taste, and differences due to class and section. Yet all along the line a lessening of the home is apparent and inevitable. This challenges both the wife and husband. The latter is most likely to neglect the family because his contribution, except perhaps the bringing in of family income and carrying on of discipline, seems unimportant. The fact is the exact reverse. Unless he deliberately endeavors to invest himself as a person in the interrelations of the family association, the family shrinks to the proportions of the home itself and becomes relatively unimportant in the life of all its members.

It would be unfortunate to interpret the present situation by assuming that it is only the father's contribution that is necessary to bring about a satisfactory family life. According to this logic, the husband could be dismissed from responsibility just as soon as the children had grown up, or if there were no children his freedom would be only slightly less than before he married. The husband's part is what needs to be emphasized, for public opinion still takes it for granted that the father of children assumes obligations.

Contrast in Husband's Reactions

It is only fair to the facts to notice that there seem to be two trends at present with reference to the husband's responsibilities. These trends are not conscious decisions so much as the influence of social opportunity, and personal inclinations that are seldom analyzed.

Some men show, as the marriage goes on, a lessening of conscious need of family experience. Men of this sort have their richest family life at the start and move from the early days of marriage irresistibly toward a life program which is essentially like that they enjoyed before their wedding. The lessening importance of the home as a means of administering human comfort provides opportunity for many men to grow away from the home as they advance in years. The passing of sex interest, or, on the part of some, the detachment of sex from their interest in their wives, makes all the easier the development of this independent type of man. The trend has already gone so far that it is not surprising that we have from some the proclamation that the normal matrimonial career for the husband as well as for the wife should largely pass away as the momentum of early physical attraction lags and largely disappears.

Other men develop an increasing comradeship as time moves on. To them the family from the start has had the

possibility of greater growth. Each family season bears its characteristic fruit. These men do not regret the passing of spring, because there have been no losses not offset by greater gain. To this group marriage has not been exclusively a sex experience, nor are they, if they have children, merely responsible during the time when the children are young and necessarily must have assistance.

It is probably best to say that the great difference between these two classes is in their degree of domestication. The first class is likely to find in marriage a temporary zest purchased at the price of irksome obligations that are shaken off the moment social convention and conscience permit, while the other group are those who are drawn to the home as the means of fulfillment of the entire range of human desires. There is no reason to suppose that either group will so predominate as to be the standard. These differences have always existed between men; it is merely true now that present culture permits husbandhood to be, like parenthood, largely a matter of choice.

That the first group furnishes a larger porportion of divorces there can be no doubt, since many of these men are intolerant of even the remnants of domestic responsibility, while others of the same class find in a repetition of the early zestful days of marriage the only satisfactory matrimonial program. The series of divorces obtained by these individuals are born of the desire to remain stationary on the earliest level of marriage relationship. When time pushes them beyond these early days they grow dissatisfied and ask the state to relieve them of continued responsibility.

We have every reason to suppose that society, if it makes a genuine endeavor through education to influence the husband's rôle, can greatly add to the number of those who find in marriage a persistent source of satisfaction, so that

time welds them all the more firmly to the domestic experience.

Insecurity of Family Income

Before the family can be given the security it needs, there must be a more practical recognition of the instability of the husband's rôle as income-maker for the home. With the development of modern industry the economic contribution of the wife has dribbled away until it is in many homes exceedingly small. It is true that the wife as housekeeper carries on necessary activities, but they represent primarily expenditures, necessary though they are, rather than income. Unless the woman works, or the children, the economic security of the home, except in cases of inherited wealth, is utterly dependent upon the success or failure, the health, illness or accident of the husband. It is hardly fair that any family should be entirely at the mercy of one man's earning ability. The family is more than a personal convenience. It makes an indispensable contribution to the state. Its welfare should be safeguarded because what it does is supremely important.

At present there is an increasing pressure for the wife to leave the home and enter outside occupation in order to provide a secondary source of income for the family. When she can do this without detriment to her particular family circle, her vocation is a happy solution of the problem of finances. Unfortunately at the time that she needs most help, when the children are little or just before they are born, she ordinarily cannot work. If anything happens to her husband and she is forced out to carry the load entirely by herself, it is often at the expense of the family, which is doubly mutilated owing to the loss of the husband added to the curtailment of the mother's services.

Attraction of Out-of-Home Work

The pressure that leads the wife to work outside the family is frequently not strict economic necessity, but the natural desire to improve the standards of life and to enjoy greater luxuries. This is not detrimental to the family unless it means that the wife's choice brings new comforts and additional recreation at the expense of a more genuine family experience. It is easy for the wife to rationalize her motives and to insist that she must work, when she really wishes to rid herself of family responsibilities and is willing to sacrifice either husband or children or both in order that she may have what seem to her more desirable pleasures on account of her failure to interpret the resources of the home.

The economic situation is not so simple that the wife's working is merely an addition to the family income. In the long run, as more women work, they become competitors with men and the final result is to decrease the earning power of the man himself. If this happens in quantity, it will mean that many homes cannot maintain reasonable standards unless the wife does work, even though it may be her preference and that of her husband that she should assume only the care of the home, an undertaking usually quite sufficient to occupy the entire time and attention of the mother of children.

Family Insurance

There is need of carrying the mother's pension farther and frankly recognizing the importance of insuring the family as such. Perhaps society will be driven to this policy by a decreasing birth rate which reveals the growing reluctance of married couples to assume the financial burden represented by the child. The woman who marries and has children has a right to feel that the burden which she willingly

assumes must not fall entirely upon her shoulders with the passing of her husband or his inability to find work or his incapacity due to illness or accident. The central position of the family in society justifies the elimination as far as possible of economic hazard. The ties of family kinship that gave financial security to the family in the past are becoming less effective. The agitation for family funds, the spread of mothers' pensions, and the advocacy of various sorts of insurance are steps in the direction of frankly recognizing that the family justifies greater protection than the husband as an individual can hope to provide.

THE NEW MARRIAGE *

WILFRED LAY

Certain it is that the chrysalis, man, is emerging from the cocoon of tradition.—DR. ROBIE.

Wilfred Lay, the author of *A Plea for Monogamy,* from which the following chapter is reprinted, was born in Brooklyn, New York, in the year 1872. He graduated from Columbia University in 1893 with Phi Beta Kappa honors, and in 1898 received his doctorate from the same institution, and continued his studies abroad at the University of Bönn.

He married Anna R. Melville of New York City in 1896. To them have been born three children, Theodore Melville, Dorothea, and Sylvia.

Dr. Lay has followed the teaching profession since 1898 and is now head of the Psychology Department of Flushing High School, New York.

His contributions to literature have been mainly in the field of Psychology. He is the author of: *Man's Unconscious Conflict,* 1917; *The Child's Unconscious Mind,* 1919; *Unconscious Passion,* 1920; *The Child's Unconscious Spirit,* 1921; and *A Plea for Monogamy,* in 1923.

THE new husband is the man who realizes that the type of passion which he has idealized to himself as appropriate for himself is logically quite as appropriate for his wife. Quite as logically he may deduce that if there is, therefore, to be not only no double standard with regard to promiscuity, but also no double standard with regard to the rights to erotic exaltation, he may create a single standard by means of reducing the number of his love episodes to a minimum of intercourse for procreation only. Many men have done this, or nearly this. But all who try it find that there are two sets of difficulties in the way, the difficulty of attain-

* From *A Plea for Monogamy,* by Wilfred Lay, published by Boni & Liveright, New York, 1923, and reprinted with their full consent.

ing this semi-ascetic end from the purely volitional point of view, and the difficulty, or more exactly the detriment, which modern science is beginning to demonstrate as inevitably coming to the psychic as well as the physical powers of the ascetic individual.

Also the single standard idea is to be transferred to the degree to which each partner carries, and is carried, in the love episode. Truly a double standard in this respect is little better than a double standard in promiscuity. There is no good reason why it should be right for a husband to reach his erotic acme at each love episode and wrong, or even indifferent, for the wife. The true single standard of married life implies, therefore, that the same standard of erotic gratification should be for both husband and wife. Man has no biological privilege here over woman. What is right for man must also be right for woman. So we see that the new husband is the one who recognizes the single standard of monogamy and also that of hologamy which provides for the wife's erotic acme as well as for the husband's.

Woman fundamentally and biologically calls for man to be the stronger to impregnate by force the impregnable fortress of her femininity, and he who fails to do this fails to make a good husband. The training for husbandship, irrespective of wealth or social position, should start from this fundamental principle of masculine control of the marital situation. This control should begin at the altar, and never weaken, never relax for a moment, except at the times when the wife is by her erotic emotions at the climax of the love episode incapable of witnessing its relaxation, at least of envying her husband.

After a long courtship in which there has been much worship of the woman by the man, there may tend to be preserved, to hang over, a sort of worship habit in the husband;

but this should give place to an inflexible attitude and a positive aggressive treatment, Petruchio-like, yet only in the erotic sphere, increasing in power as the years go by. Woman will test it hourly to detect any weakening, jealous of the strength to be handed down to her offspring. It is unconscious in her. She cannot help it.

In the modern woman with a vocation, to which there cannot be a possible objection if it does not exclude her proper maternity, the relation to her husband must still be one of emotional subservice. She cannot control him emotionally without making herself a mother-imago to him. He cannot, even unconsciously, accept this control of himself by her, without regressing to the condition of being dominated by the mother-imago, without being to her as her child and not her man.

Modern marriage must be an entirely new and different thing from most previous marital relations. Mastery over the woman must remain, if marriage is to continue; but it must be a spiritual mastery, a love mastery in place of the old Rome-inherited legal, economic and physical mastery. Thus the poor husband of a rich wife need lose no mastery, nor need the non-professional husband of a professional wife, nor the unintellectual husband of an intellectual wife, the uneducated husband of an educated wife.

Mastery or control does not consist any more in the regulation by the man of any egoistic-social activities of the woman, the dictating of what she shall do or wear or think, nor in the acts of the man himself consciously designed to steer her this way or that. Mastery does consist in what the husband, and the husband alone, can make the wife feel. It does consist in the establishment and maintenance of a sense on her part of belonging to him, which he can develop even though granting her in the egoistic-social sphere, the most absurd license—the *Horigkeit* (mentioned by Freud) based

on the peculiar intensity with which he gratified after awakening it in early married life, her erotic need.

Possibly the great increase in the number of divorces is due to the increasing expectation of something unutterably fine in marriage and an inevitable disillusionment resulting from concrete experience. There would be no divorce on the grounds of adultery if the married woman felt that her paramour could give her no joy remotely resembling what her husband could. The adultery of the man, too, comes from disappointment. Where there is absolutely complete satisfaction the motive for adultery cannot exist.

The man or woman with conscious and unconscious passion of the one for the other developed into a habit may be attracted by other women but the other woman's attractiveness will not be so great as his wife's. And deflection in either husband or wife, if they think at all precisely on their action, must be quite repugnant to them in every way. The uncontrolled man who does not master his wife's erotic emotions is disappointed in her and seeks his supreme gratification with another woman who appears to be able to give him what he thinks he cannot get from his wife in the way of appreciation, sympathy or understanding.

If this is the man's attitude then, of course, he cannot have grasped the idea of the higher monogamy, which is not that of getting but of giving. No man in any degree cognizant of the concept of true mating can fail to find even the woman to whom he happens to be married, able to receive if he practices properly the technique of presentation. He must have found certain qualities in her before he married her, which his awkwardness in presenting himself have perturbed, and he can now review these and work upon them, until he is utterly accepted. For his presentation of himself and his service to her in the worship of Eros are the

only means toward his adequately virile satisfaction. *Credite expertis.*

No one who has had prosperity in the egoistic-social sphere, who has had a comfortable home, for example, will choose adversity, will therefore prefer to live in a tenement, noisy, squalid. No man who has experienced the greater profundities of virile control of the total erotic situation will choose to give any less of himself to his wife. No wife who has received from her husband the maximun that a man can give, which is himself—that is, his supreme control of himself and of her—will choose to look for anything greater or higher, for it does not exist even in the most extravagant imagination.

In the marriage of the future we must make sure that the art of love is thoroughly learned by the husband. Without it, he has only a small chance of making a successful marriage. And we must see to it that this new art of love be not like Ovid's, the adulterer's art of winning a woman away from her home, but the husband's art of retaining her in it.

This will require a readjustment, possibly of the concept of "home." The home meant here is not in any sense the material house and furniture and embellishments. The home is the family, to which all the members should belong in a sense far more spiritual than the average. The truly mated couple belong to the family forever and to the children, until the latter marry and make families of their own. Any deflection from the purely hologamous ideal on the part of either the husband-father or wife-mother is a misfortune to the latter, but unequivocally the fault of the former.

The marriage of the future, if it is to follow the single-standard pattern of equal joy for equal mutuality, will be in no way inferior to any type of so-called romantic marriage of today. It will have all the totality of fusion of the

individual's body and soul, all the fusion of the personalities of the two mates. It will have all the finality and indissolubility now wished for it by the present generation whose marital relations begin to crumble in a year or less. It will never degenerate into a situation where life seems not worth living, but will be the only circumstance in which life is consciously and perennially known, as well as believed and felt, to be thoroughly worth while.

By their confusion of the two levels of control women lose much of the happiness that would come to them from the direct control exercised over them by men, on the erotic level. Into the love episode egoistic-social impulses, being the uninvited guest at a feast, only intrude. Women's sphere of active control is limited, on all rational grounds, to the work in the world which they choose for themselves apart from being wives.

It is equally true, too, that if the erotic life is to be rationally developed in both partners the husband will have to keep carefully separated the egoistic-social in his life from the erotic. There is much talk about the ability of a woman to be a mother, which tacitly implies being a housewife, and at the same time to be a professional woman or to do anything whatever of an egoistic-social nature outside of her home.

The idea never seems to have occurred to anybody that in an equitable marriage at least, not to mention an ideal one, the husband has any part to play in the construction of that spiritual situation which should constitute the home. The father really has as vital a part to play in the home as the mother. There is no perfect home that does not contain these two absolutely equally unifying factors. "What in home without a father?" is quite as pertinent a question as the other trite one.

This does not for a moment imply that the duties of the

father and mother in the material home should be the same. This would give only a literal verbal significance to the statement that a man's duty is quite as much toward his home as is a woman's. If we were simply using words that sounded reasonable we might as well repeat the oft expressed and seemingly perfectly balanced retort of woman to her husband: "If I have to bear the child, why on earth shouldn't you care for it?"

To illustrate with a concrete example the utter helplessness of some of the finest women, the following excerpt is made, with his permission, from a letter received by Dr. Robie:

> The man whom I finally married came into my life as an intellectual wonder. I marvelled at his knowledge and his worldy poise. . . . Whenever I pleaded for consideration, kindness, he would say: "Haven't you a home, clothes, money, a baby? What more do you want?" or "Haven't I told you once that I love you? Can't you take that for granted?"
>
> No gentleness, no petting, just hardness and the greatest conceit over his own personality and ability.
>
> I found at dances that other men could thrill me, and one man in particular. . . . He never knew it.
>
> I got the reputation of being a perfect mother, and a beauty, and my spirit never has been broken; but my faith is broken. My love is as dead as last year's leaves; and I scorn men who stop being lovers on their wedding night.
>
> Health, enthusiasm, good nature, big sense of humour, beauty, ideal birth inheritance, magnetism, yes, and passion—for I am not cold, but very impulsive and affectionate—all this lost to the right man, and the wrong one quite content, apparently, in his worldly

> successes, and with a cultured wife who does not bother him, and keeps his noisy brood of children at a distance.
>
> This comes from a bursting heart. It is true I am a success as a mother; and the world thinks I am in all ways. Yet that greatest of all things, *love,* is denied me.

The father's part in the home is something, however, far more hypersomatic than that, more spiritual. The truly husbanded wife will make the egoistic-social aspects of home-keeping so much her own business that she will tend to appropriate more than she should really have.

If rugs have to be beaten and windows washed, and there is no money to hire a man to do it, the wife will do it, frequently, and the husband, who does not husband his wife's health and beauty will let her. And so on up the egoistic-social scale till we reach the millionaire who might do certain things for his wife much more acceptably than hirelings, but dissociates himself more and more from her.

The management of the children is really an egoistic-social affair, in which some men are much better able to plan, and execute plans than the most women. The management of very young children in the home is something that no paterfamilias can afford to leave entirely to women. This is by all odds the most important part of the child's life.

It does not mean that the banker or politician should spend hour after hour in the nursery, though, indeed, he should know pretty well what goes on there. The nature of the personal contacts the child gets in the nursery is a determining factor in many cases, in the way in which he will later behave in his marital existence. In the nursery, meaning by that any locality where the child spends most of his playtime and sleeping time, he gets the experiences from

which later he may develop neuroses phobias, and other emotional disorders. He forms there usually his mother-imago, for even if he belongs to the class of children who never see their own mothers except on the rarest occasions, he will form his mother ideal from his hired nurse, or from any other woman with whom he comes into close contact.

Here then, the egoistic-social trends of the parents play an important rôle in determining the erotic life of the child. The egoistic-social pressure exerted on one or both parents withdraws them from their children, and partly or wholly orphans them. Many a child's father is no more personal than a checking bank.

Not only, therefore, does the absorption of the parents by egoistic-social trends diminish the chances of their own erotic development as husband and wife, a development that takes time, energy and imagination, but it deprives their children of the proper environment in which to develop the germs of future wholesome erotism.

Parents and children should spend a certain amount of time in each other's company during which they do nothing but love each other all around and have a jolly good time together. It is just as important for the parents to banish egoistic-social claims for short periods and actually loaf and fool around with the children as it is for the children to have a taste of adult idling company. Such, for example, is a real picnic or camping trip or ocean voyage, or any situation that brings parents and children together.

It is important, too, for every woman to keep clearly separated in her mind and in her action the two levels, egoistic-social and erotic. Only then is she in a satisfactory position to become a wife in a higher sense than that in which most women are wives, and her becoming a mother

need interfere in no way with her remaining a wife to her husband.

It is therefore to the advantage of man to realize that, however much he may value his wife's clear intuition in egoistic-social matters, he is to be sure about their utter exclusion from matters purely erotic. A man can never fall in love with a conventionally so-called unattractive woman solely because she has a good business head. If any man should think so, he would find, on closer analysis, that, if he was really in love, his motive was truly erotic. If he cannot find any really erotic factor in his attitude toward her, his union with her can never be a complete marriage.

He has confused the two levels. He cannot love her because she can manage a library or a bond broker's office or an insurance agency, any more than he can love her really because she knows how to make fudge. He may be attracted by the fudge. He is undoubtedly attracted unconsciously by other factors truly erotic in her character. Otherwise he would be more prudent to marry the fudge rather than the girl.

Similarly if the woman thinks she attracts by her business or culinary ability she is confusing levels. There are some women who unfortunately, because erroneously, believe they have little or no erotic attraction. Plain in face, not well formed, possibly under-weight, complexions not clear, they think that by sedulously following egoistic-social trends they can make an appeal to other people and particularly to men. They fail to see that these trends have hardly anything to do with love, that, once they love, their form improves, that the homeliest face, once lighted by the fire of love, has a beauty all its own, pure and irresistible.

The same is true of unloving, unillumined, unfired men. Judging erroneously from a confusion of the two levels, they fail to see not only that erotic trends are the strongest

and most universal in the world, but that being the fundamentally vital trends they are almost inexhaustible and provide the untapped energy which the egoistic-social thinking of these different men makes them fear to draw upon.

The mathematical exactness of the comparison of men on the egoistic-social level makes many a man think his erotic impulses are similarly inferior. He should ponder well upon the prodigality of nature, remembering that he, too, is part of nature.

Unrestrained nature is most prodigal. The thousands of ova and millions of spermatozoa produced in every woman and man show that the analogy is false that is drawn between the human body and a mere container like a basket. Anything with life cannot be exhausted until life has gone, and yet through asceticism the secretions can be rendered great or small or almost nonexistent. Men can make eunuchs of themselves by force of will, yet their egoistic-social performances are not improved but rather impoverished by the process.

Men should train themselves to produce, which consists in being lavish of self in every manner. The richest are those who give most. The miser is the poorest man in the world and the most miserable.

Fear of giving self is the fear of losing self. What most men fear if they love their wives too much is that they will impoverish themselves and enrich their wives, thus making their wives contemptuous of their resultant poverty. But the poorest man or woman is the one who has not begun to love, and many are such even in the married state.

And they begin to enrich themselves even more than each other, when they give each to other the uttermost that is in them.

Giving is the only thing that produces fertility of giving. It is tapping the inexhaustible, the only way in which to

unite oneself to the infinite. Withholding is closing up the gate to universal strength and power.

Control is not annihilation or denial. It is direction of an endless stream of energy. If the energy is not delivered it cannot be directed and therefore cannot be controlled.

The tragedy of present-day marital life lies in the deception men practice on themselves by believing that annihilation is a kind of control.

The facts of the intimate marital relations of most couples are too unlovely to be welcomed by most people, but in order to progress it is necessary to face them.

In the new marriage the husband, therefore, will relinquish certain of the egoistic-social spheres of action and will confine his attention solely to those most closely associated with the erotic. He will assume the responsibilities for these.

Trial marriage is little more than a method of testing man's control in the erotic sphere. It implies that if a man is found lacking in control over one woman, he may be tried with another, in the hope that with the second up to the *nth* he may find a woman whom he can control. But as stated elsewhere in this book the probability of an uncontrolled man's acquiring control by a superficial trial and error method is almost nil.

Science has not a word to say against permanent marriage if the pair are really compatible. What constitutes compatibility, however, is much more a mental attitude on the part of the husband. A man that thinks he has to have a special, peculiar type of woman for a wife, or because of a bringing up in an excessively romantic family thinks there is only one woman in the world, specially born for him, who alone can make him happy in marriage, or who thinks he has found her when he has fallen in love at first sight, assumes no responsibility for his own happiness, but fatalistically waits for destiny to provide him with a suitable spouse.

"Spouse" is derived from Latin *spondeo* which is at the root of the word response, and means "to promise solemnly." This refers to what the person confidently expects to get, not himself contribute to the union. But it has been clear to the seers of all ages that giving is the only true getting.

On the basis of giving, almost any woman can be made a wife, but never in the sense of spouse if it has its ancient meaning of a person bound to give something.

If a young man is given the proper training in the right way, which shows him that the most intensely physical contacts are emotionally worthless without the spiritual factor in the truly erotic, and that the intimacies of marital life are far more determined by hypersomatic (spiritual) facts than by physical ones, that he has the privilege of making his married life as romantic as he wishes or can leave it quite prosaic and dull; if he knows this, even a provisional marriage entered into with a woman not positively distasteful to him can be made a triumphant success.

The proviso, however, will be made by most people that there must be an original rapport between the two. It is the unequivocal position of this book, on the contrary, that the rapport, even if it never existed, can be created by the husband, by means of his own creative power.

This implies neither that the rapport is solely a physical one nor that it is based on solely physical factors. Nor does it imply that a perfect marital love that has all the qualities of the romantic may not, by the proper behavior on the husband's part, be progressively developed as the years pass. Indeed, the fully matured love of at least a quarter of a century's duration is the only marital love that has any claim to be called romantic. In the young, love is not romantic but may be spectacular, in its expression, or in the egoistic-social circumstances which surround it, but the only perfect love of a man and a woman is the one that has the growth of years.

If a man knowing the true technique which is more spiritual (more hypersomatic) than physical in every instance, though impossible without the complete combination of physical and spiritual, chooses any woman whatever of his own free will, and uses with her the real love technique of word and deed, he cannot fail to find in her his erotic complement, if she be really a woman.

The choice, it is admitted, is the work largely of his unconscious. The unconscious is an absolutely accurate registering apparatus; and as such is the real foundation of the choice of a mate.

But it should not for a moment be forgotten that the unconscious mechanisms that present this woman as more attractive than that to a man are only the foundation of the edifice of his marital love which it is his triumph to build with his own hands.

And it should equally well be remembered that the erotic control is his, and will remain his, if the marriage is to prove happy; also that the erotic control is more spiritual than physical, though it can never endure without the physical.

The duty of marriage is the procreation of healthy children. The privilege and pleasure of marriage is what Havelock Ellis has called the play side of love.

If the husband does not secure and by superior knowledge of love insist on securing in his wife this essential of human marriage, his marriage is only legal, only social, and has no love instinct back of it. It is not an erotic union. Erotic unions are the only healthy ones.

Erotic unions are the only healthy ones not merely in the sense of health-giving to the partners, but also in the sense of having themselves a healthy growth in progressively embracing all human activities, in which the partners are concerned in egoistic and social lines, embracing them in such a

way that the love instinct increases its control over the ego instinct. This increase is the real object of a love marriage, not increase of wealth, honor, distinction, and experience of the world but increase of the dominance of love over self.

Possibly this dependence of the woman on the man to unfold her accounts for man's instinctive desire to marry a virgin. Unconsciously he may imagine that to make her most his own, she should have been influenced erotically by no other man.

Whether or not the future development of the general attitude toward marriage will include an insistence on the woman's being a virgin when she enters the marital state, there are still some considerations concerning both the physical and the psychical condition of virginity, both of men and of women, that are pertinent today, and that seem advisable to take up at this point.

The study of the unconscious throws an important sidelight upon the matter of the termination of physical virginity of women.

It has been clearly shown that this termination when, as is frequently the case, it is accompanied by sudden and severe pain on the rupture of the hymen, is the cause of a revulsion of feeling on the woman's part, utterly incommensurate with the actual intensity and duration of the pain, a feeling also of which she never is, and possibly never becomes, directly conscious; but, if the pain is caused by the action of the husband, it is the cause of a resentment which, in the wife's unconscious, is ever after associated with her husband.

From this point of view it would seem more felicitous if that unconscious association of ideas could be made in her mind with some other man, *e.g.* the family doctor, if it is an inevitable association and absolutely uncontrolled by the wife, as all deeply unconscious mental processes are. It would seem that a man would profit by not being the par-

ticular man associated in his wife's unconscious with a painful incident that cuts so deep. This applies to the average uninstructed man but not to the adept or even inexperienced man who is willing and able to act intelligently and profit by the knowledge now available about how to avoid this one of the many mischances that may occur in the case of the virgin episode.

This phenomenon of the unconscious resentment due to the forcible and painful termination of merely physical virginity is recognized in the frequently happy second married life of women who have lost their first husbands, and in the customs of some savage tribes in which no woman becomes a wife until she has been deflowered by the official appointed by the tribe for that special purpose.

The inference from these facts is not necessarily that a man will be more happy with a wife who comes to him "impure" or widowed; though this may be the case. The inference is, on the other hand, that the man, if he knows enough, will be able in the very first love episode so to act that the bride inflicts any necessary pain on herself, and not he on her; making all the difference in the world to her, because in this case, never, even in her own unconscious, can she lay up against her husband this cause of resentment. The technically instructed husband thus gains an initial prestige with his wife and with her unconscious, which enormously increases his erotic control of her emotions—the *sine qua non* of a felicitous marriage, that essential condition for fully functioning adult human life.

Women are unable to control or direct their own development in the erotic sphere up to the point of greatest exultation. They are perforce required to be developed by men. But, in from fifty to seventy per cent of marriages, men are too uninterested or too ignorant to develop their wives' erotism to this point, and, of course, to develop their own

erotism to the necessary degree of self-control whereby they can secure the total erotic relaxation of their wives.

So that when we say that men are more virginal than women we imply a responsibility on the husband's part, and none whatever on the wife's part, for the proper erotic development which alone constitutes the basis of a permanent monogamy.

That is the reason for saying that in the love episode control is the husband's organically, fundamentally, biologically. The husband reader of this book should ask himself whether he has exercised the adequate amount of control in the erotic sphere. Has he left his wife, the mother of his children, in the condition of being psychically a virgin? If he has, he must realize that he, too, is in a sense, himself a virgin. This signifies primarily that because his wife's erotism is left undeveloped, his own is too. Undeveloped erotism is no secure bond, no perfect assurance, of a true monogamy.

He will need to take the matter into his own hands and truly marry his wife by means of fully developing his own and her erotism. This need of marrying one's own wife is the greatest need of the present day. It can be fulfilled only by more knowledge and more (truly erotic) passion on the part of the husband.

The husband, therefore, who has not in this sense married his own wife, is illogical in thinking that there is any justice or beauty or poetry or romance in any attempted affiliation, liaison or other intimate relation with any other woman. On the other hand, the husband who has married his wife in this sense, will neither seek nor need the intimacy of any other woman than his wife.

The phantasied happiness with any other woman rests solely on the thought that the erotic development of the other would be easier for him, or that it would be unnecessary. If it is unnecessary it has been accomplished by some other man; for true mutual erotic relations are not attained

by a woman alone or by two women, man being the only developer of woman's erotism.

He may think indeed that some extra-marital woman actually loves him, and that his wife does not. This may be true, if he is fully developed himself, has made sincere attempts for years to develop his wife and, in spite of his own best thought and advice of erotologists, has found that she is definitely ineducable. This is an exceedingly rare case.

It may appear that the extra-marital woman loves him, and that he loves her; but the experience of many centuries has shown that, except in the rarest of instances, the woman is ignorant of her own true feelings and that the attempt on the man's part to develop her erotically would be a failure.

If his own desire for the extra-marital woman is conditioned, as it so often is, on the mentally autoerotic nature of his own satisfactions, which his lack of success with his wife has, in most cases, amply proved, his success in the adulterous union is not likely to be any greater. He will be most likely to expect an easier conquest in the extra-marital liaison than in the marital relation. His going from the marital one to one fancied easier is an evidence of his mental auto-erotism.

In conclusion it may be said that the feeling on the part of any critic of modern civilization that marriage has been a failure applies only to the facts of the imperfect carrying out of the ideal of monogamy. We may remind such critics that, like Christianity, monogamy (in the sense of hologamy of the total physical and psychical fusion of man and wife) cannot be called a failure, because in the vast majority of persons, it simply has not been given a fair trial. External, conscious, superficial fidelity is not true hologamy any more than lip service is Christianity; and, as a whole, civilized peoples have not yet succeeded in attaining faith either in the one or in the other.

FREE DIVORCE *

ELLEN KEY

Death claimed the author of the following chapter in 1926 at the ripe age of seventy-seven. She had attained eminence in the world of letters by her espousal of the cause of feminism. She was born in Sweden in the year 1849; was educated in the home of her father; taught school following financial reverses suffered by her parents, and in her later years spent much of her time abroad lecturing, writing and teaching.

Some of her best known works translated in English are: *The Century of the Child; Love and Marriage; The Morality of Woman; Love and Ethics; The Woman Movement; Rahel Varnhagen; The Renaissance of Motherhood;* etc. Of these, *Love and Marriage,* from which the chapter "Free Divorce" is taken, is the best known.

THE desire of the young to abolish prostitution by means of love's freedom has already been adduced as one of the proofs of the higher development of sexual morality. Another such proof is the desire of the present day to abolish adultery by means of free divorce.

The preachers of monogamy are afraid that this desire will prepare the way for an open polygamy, instead of that which at present is at least secret. In the press and in the pulpit, in schoolrooms and lecture-rooms, modern literature is blamed for this "new immorality."

And yet we all know that long before our time, married men and their sons in country houses were too often ready to seduce the wives and daughters of their dependents as well as the servants of the house. The wives and mothers of these gentlemen were frequently not ignorant of this—but

* From *Love and Marriage,* published by G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, and reprinted with their kind permission.

they were praised for their wisdom when they pretended to suspect nothing. It was a matter of common knowledge that not a few married men and married women had mistresses and lovers within their own social circle; and every one knew that in the towns many men, during or before marriage, had illegitimate families.

Serious preachers of morality doubtless reply that they no more condone this secret adultery than they would an open one; that they see in one and the other a manifestation of that power of sin which only religion can vanquish. We have the right then to ask, whether within their own ranks —among clergymen, missionaries, readers—no similar transgressions occur.

The honest ones answer Yes, but point out that this causes shame among their fellow Christians, and that these believers themselves acknowledge that they have sinned. Such men of the world, who play the hypocrite to retain their respectability, do the same thing. But the great danger to society first comes in when free-thinkers with no qualms of conscience commit, and authors without moral indignation uphold, the sin. This it is that degrades the ideal of morality.

Here we are at the very crossroads of the old and the new morality.

The champions of the latter go on to ask whether all adulterers—children of this world as well as the children of God—in their innermost consciousness really feel themselves to be sinners. The need which impelled them was perhaps so imperious that it justified them before their own conscience in choosing a lesser evil in preference to a greater, when—from one cause or another—they could not or ought not to satisfy the need in their marriage.

And if this be so, then the exponents of the new morality may have grounds for their opinion; that self-control cannot and must not be the only answer to all the problems of

sexual life; that a solution must be found which shall by degrees prevent men from wasting, either in unchastity or in a celibacy disguised as marriage, the strength which belongs to the race. The solution can only be this, that we not only assert love's freedom to unite without external tie, but also man's right more freely than at present to loosen the tie, when real union is no longer possible.

When speaking of love's selection, it was put forward that a growing insight into the value and conditions of the enhancement of the race might produce cases where a marriage could be openly broken without therefore being dissolved. But the true line of development will quite certainly be this: that divorce will be free, depending solely on the will of both parties or of one, maintained for a certain time; that public opinion as regards a dissolved marriage will take the broader view that it has already acquired in the question of a broken engagement, which at one time was thought just as humiliating as a divorce is now.

With ever-growing seriousness the new conception of morality is affirmed: that the race does not exist for the sake of monogamy, but monogamy for the sake of the race; that mankind is therefore master of monogamy, to preserve or to abolish it.

Even the advocates of free divorce know well enough that it will involve abuses. But at the same time they know that there is no better proof of man's incredible indolence of mind than the uneasiness produced by the thought of possible abuses resulting from a new social form, while the ancient abuses are tolerated with the dullest tranquillity.

Whatever abuses free divorce may involve, they cannot often be worse than those whose marriage has produced and still produces—marriage, which is degraded to the coarsest sexual habits, the most shameless traffic, the most agonizing soul-murders, the most inhuman cruelties, and the grossest

infringements of liberty that any department of modern life can show.

We may answer that abuses do not prove anything against the value of any particular social arrangement, so long as its right use serves well the purpose for which it was introduced.

The majority thinks that this is still the case with marriage. The minority, on the other hand, considers that its constraint now tends to defeat its original object, an enhanced sexual morality.

This minority thinks that, as soon as love is admitted as the moral ground of marriage, it will be a necessary consequence that he who has ceased to love should be allowed a moral as well as a legal right to withdraw from his marriage, if he chooses to avail himself of this right.

And this same minority is aware that love may cease, independently of a person's will; that therefore no one can be held to the terms of a promise, the performance of which lies outside his powers.

Nothing is more natural than that love's longing for eternity should prompt lovers to vows of eternal fidelity; nothing is more true than that it is a satanic device of society to seize upon this promise and base thereon a legal institution (Carpenter). Nothing is more necessary than to abolish the legal claims that people have on one another, supported by promises of love and vows of fidelity.

The more people understand the laws of their own being, the more will the conscientious begin to hesitate about making promises which perhaps some day they will be forced by inner necessity to break. An increasing number of people find it impossible to contract marriage, or to ask it of the other party—or to continue in marriage or ask its continuance of the other—when their love has died or has awakened for another. A generation ago, an engaged person could refuse his or her betrothed's petition for liberation with the answer

that he or she had love enough for both. In corresponding circles at the present day, such a speech is unthinkable. But then a public engagement was still regarded as a binding tie and the marriage took place. After a long engagement it was a "point of honor" for the man not to let a woman run the risk of being unmarried, and she was satisfied if he only paid his debt of honor.

Such coarseness of feeling is fortunately becoming more and more rare, although it is far from disappearing. People see more and more that they have no more right to marry simply to fulfill a duty of fidelity than they have to steal in order to fulfill a duty of maintenance; that there is no more obligation to abide by a marriage which one feels to be one's ruin than there is a duty to commit suicide for the sake of another.

The love of older times was above all afraid that the other party should not feel sufficiently bound. The finest erotic feeling of the present day shudders at the idea of becoming a bond; trembles at pity and recoils from the possibility of becoming a hindrance. This state of the soul knows of no other right than that of perfect candor. To place legal limits to each other's liberty, so that neither shall cause pain to the other, is under these conditions meaningless; for each suffers just as much through a union maintained without full reciprocity.

Thus the question of divorce presents itself to modern souls, in cases where there are no children. And when there are children—as is of course the rule—they think that the mistakes of parents do not absolve them from the duty of coöperating in the rearing of the children to whom they have given life.

But they maintain that this need not always be effected by means of continued cohabitation. On the other hand, this may often be necessary, and in such cases they subordinate

their personal claims of happiness to those of the race. One who holds these opinions regards him who gives the same answer in every case—whether this answer be "freedom at any price" or "renunciation at any price"—simply as a moral automaton.

It is true that modern men and women are less able to bear unhappiness in marriage than were those of former times. This shows that connubial idealism makes greater demands than formerly.

The conscious will to live, of our time, revolts against the meaningless sufferings through which the people of bygone days, above all women, allowed themselves to be degraded, benumbed, and embittered. A finer knowledge of self, a stronger consciousness of personality, now puts a limit to one's own suffering, since the danger is understood of taking hurt in one's soul. This determination of individualism makes it impossible for the modern woman to be fired by the ideal of Griselda—if for no other reason, because she feels how all-suffering meekness increases injustice. The "good old" marriages, sustained by the willing sacrifice of wives, are disappearing—that is happily true! But no one takes notice of the new good ones that are coming in their place. If those who now grudgingly reckon up divorces would also count all happy marriages, it would be seen that new formation has proceeded further than dissolution.

It must be evident that the question of divorce is the pursuance of the line of development of Protestantism. With the formation of a right and a left party, as usual in the treatment of a problem of culture, the Reformation succeeded only in asserting the right of the senses in human life. That it is the right of the soul in sexual life that is now most intimately affected by the question people will not understand. Against the right of the individual they set up that

of the child. If there is none, then a certain number of Christians are willing to admit that divorce is sometimes justified. Unhappy parents, on the other hand, must remain together for the sake of the children.

But the erotically noble person of the present day cannot, without the deepest sense of humiliation, belong to one he does not love, or by whom he knows he is not loved. Thus for one or both of the parties a marriage that is persisted in without the love of one or both causes profound suffering either through this humiliation or through lifelong celibacy.

This is the kernel of the question, which is avoided by all who, in their care for the children, forget that the parents must nevertheless be considered as an end in themselves. It is not asked that for the sake of the children they should commit other crimes; thus a woman who committed forgery to support her child would be disapproved of. But other women are judged leniently who "for the sake of their children" feel themselves prostituted year after year in their marriage.

That married people are to be found who continue to live as friends, since the erotic needs of both are small; that others do not feel the humiliation of cohabitation without love; that the former as well as the latter are probably acting best for the children in keeping together a home for them—this does not prevent others under similar circumstances from suffering in such a way that life loses all its value. And these are they who end either in adultery or divorce.

Even if an enemy of divorce admits these difficulties, he replies, that the individual must still suffer for his erotic as for his other mistakes, since only so can people be taught not to commit mistakes.

But the true state of the case may be, that just as in old times murders increased in proportion to the number of executions people witnessed, so unhappy marriages may

become more frequent, the more there are at present; for it is, above all, the whole spirit that prevails around us which determines our action. If the young are accustomed to see their elders content with false and ugly relations, they will learn to be so likewise. If they see around them an aspiration toward ideal conditions in love—an idealism which is revealed now in a beautiful married life, now in the dissolution of one that is not beautiful—then their ideals will also be lofty. Those again, who have once made a mistake, will perhaps be more clear-sighted if they choose a second time.

But neither those who make mistakes nor those who witness them can be saved by the misfortunes of others from that great source of error, erotic illusion. And until erotic sympathy has become more refined, these mistakes are the most innocent of all. Every lover believes himself to be exempted from the sacrifice of illusion and no experience of the irretrievable erotic mistakes of others has ever opened the eyes of one blinded by love.

As it is recognized that society ought to make the lives of all as valuable as possible, this involves the claim that innocent mistakes should cause as little ruin as need be.

In marriage, as in other fields, the modern principle must be put in force, that punishment should improve the faulty and prepare the way for a higher idea of justice. But this higher idea is that marriage should be contracted under gradually improving conditions, not that it should continue under gradually deteriorating influences.

Marriage under constraint forces people to continue their cohabitation and to bring children into the world in a revolt of the soul which must leave its mark in their children's nature and thus influence their future destiny. But this is not a "well-deserved punishment" for a mistake: it is the profoundest violation of the sanctity of the personality and of the race.

Here as ever the only logical alternative is full individual liberty or unconditional surrender.

The Catholic Church maintains—and rightly from its point of view—that, since even marriages entered into with the warmest love and under the most favorable conditions may turn out unhappily, it is impossible to base the morality of marriage on the emotion of love.

Nothing that is founded upon emotion can be permanent. Nay, the richer, the more individually and universally developed a personality is, the less immutable will be the state of its soul. Thus even the highest need an inflexible law, an irremovable tie, to prevent their being at the mercy of winds and waves through their emotions, while inferior beings need them so as not to be driven out of their course by their desires. The concessions of Protestantism, therefore, lead to the dissolution of marriage, since when love is made the basis of marriage it is built upon sand.

Marriage, which the Church therefore made a sacrament and indissoluble, had already become the legal expression of the husband's right of private ownership over his wife and children. The course of development has consisted in an unceasing transformation of this religio-economical view, and development cannot stop until the last remnant of this conception has been destroyed.

Therefore the believers in life refuse to admit either the half admissions of Protestantism or the logical compulsion of Catholicism. They demand that the step from authority to freedom shall be taken outright, since they know that the external authority which simplifies life does not create the deeper morality. Compulsion fetters legal freedom of action, but thereby only makes secret crime a social institution.

And even if a husband or a wife has outwardly overcome a temptation, this will not prevent that individual when in the embrace of the lawful spouse from being filled with feel-

ing for another. Have they then avoided adultery? Not according to their own finest consciousness—that consciousness which Goethe aroused in his great poem on elective affinities. Duties performed may as surely as those left undone produce incalculable and tragic results. They are foolish who think they can lead another soul across the bridge, fine as a hair and sharp as a knife-edge, by which every one goes his solitary way over the abyss to salvation: the way of the choice of personal conscience.

When custom and law deprive a human being of full freedom of choice in the matters of most profound personal concern—his belief, his work, and his love—then existence is robbed of greater values than those the compulsory fulfillment of duty can bring in.

In love, the idea of personality has now brought us to the view that "property is theft"; that only free gifts are of value; that the ideas of connubial "rights" and "duties" are to be exchanged for the great reconstructive thought, that fidelity can never be promised, but that indeed it may be won every day.

This will give the motive power for the attainment of ever higher forms of erotic organization, a power which the Buddha-like calm of indissoluble marriage has left unused.

It is sad that this truth—which was already clear to the noble minds of the Courts of Love—should still need proclaiming; for one of the reasons given in these Courts for Love being impossible in marriage is this: that woman cannot expect from her husband the delicate conduct that a lover must show, since the latter only receives by favor what the husband takes as his right.

When divorce becomes free, the attention to each other's emotions, the delicacy of conduct and the desire to captivate by being always new, which belong to the period of engage-

ment, will be continued in married life. As in the early days of love, each will allow the other full freedom in all essential manifestations of life, but will exercise control over his own casual moods, whereas marriage now as a rule reverses this happy state of things.

The security of possession now puts to sleep the eagerness of acquisition; the compulsion to win anew will brace the energy in this as in every other connection.

A fidelity thus won will be the only sort that will be thought worth having in the future. A craving for happiness more sensitive than the present may one day marvel at the legally insured fidelity of our time, as at its inheritance of wealth. In both cases it will have been seen that only one's exertion of force brings happiness and gives that felicity of victory before which hands stretched out to steal shrink back.

The believers in life are everywhere distinguished by their determination to give to every relation the value of the unique, the stamp of the exceptional, that which has never been before and will never come again. Like the worshipers of Life of the Renaissance, those of our time have begun to recover the power of strong enjoyment and strong suffering which is always the sign of increasing spiritual unity, a new gathering of force through a new religious feeling.

To this view of life the permanence of happiness will be less important than its completeness while it lasts.

Spinoza, who described jealousy as no one else has done, has also uttered this deep saying of love, "The greater the emotion we hope that the loved one will experience through us, and the more the loved one is moved by joy in his relation to us, the greater also will be our own happiness in love."

People of the present day have begun to distinguish the idea of this "greatest joy" from lifelong proprietorship; and

therewith jealousy in its lower form has begun to disappear.

Jealousy like other shadows belongs to the rising and setting light and disappears like them in the full clearness of noonday. But its tone of feeling has become quite different since man has discovered that, if the sun stands still in the zenith for him, it is a miracle—not a right. The most highly developed people of the present day say "I am loved" or "I am not loved" with the same simplicity as they say the sun shines or does not shine. The difference is in both cases immeasurable, but in one case as in the other, necessity removes the feeling of humiliation. The grief which comes when a lover no longer feels that he brings joy to the beloved or when he sees another bring it, is natural and worthy of respect. It ceases to be so when it manifests itself in the will of an avaricious proprietor, the brutal instinct which often survives not only the feeling of the other but also its own.

But although the psychological differentiation in our time involves greater possibilities of finding someone who will satisfy some side of the erotic longing—while it is more and more difficult to find one who wholly satisfies this ever more complex desire—the danger of such division of self is counterbalanced by the growing wish for the longing to be wholly satisfied. Love by thus making ever greater demands becomes at the same time ever more faithful.

Those who dread the dissolution of society through the insistence upon the rights of love, do not reflect that its right to break up marriage is allowed to the feeling, which has not only the red glow of passion, but also the clearness through which two people have become conscious of each other as a revelation of the whole unsuspected richness of life. A revelation which included all the fullness of comprehension, all the serenity of confidence; where both have given with equal exactingness and generosity—not meagerly

or hesitatingly, but so that each without reserve has rushed to meet the other—this is the only happiness that love's noblemen will now experience. It will be more and more difficult even to experience it once—how much more so then to find it many times!

A great love is never like the erotic thunderstorms which move against the wind—that is to say, against the whole disposition of the personality in other things.

All valuable feelings—whether entertained for a person, a belief, a place, or a country—are conservative. The consciousness of this gives the preacher of liberty his boldness. He never perceives how liberty may be abused, since he knows what it costs to loosen a heart from what it has once embraced.

To a volatile nature, the happiness that a more steadfast one experiences in love is as unfathomable as the bliss of the mystic becoming absorbed into the fullness of his divinity is to the polytheist.

Here, as everywhere, to the believer in Life, happiness is one with morality. Since happiness consists in the greatest emotions, its first condition is to intensify and enlarge all feelings, and above all that which leads to marriage.

But in addition, the whole standard of personality depends to a great extent upon whether we consider fidelity a life-value. He who desires fidelity centers his moods and his powers upon what is essential and protects them from the gusts of the accidental. Only this gives style and greatness to existence. The desire of fidelity is therefore one with a person's feeling for his own integrity, his inward consistency, the attitude and dignity of his spiritual being.

When fidelity is preserved for these profound reasons, it will also be broken only for the same reasons. A fidelity, on the other hand, which rests upon conventional notions of duty, will be in the fire like a fire-escape of straw.

It is moreover forgotten, in all discussions of the dangers of free divorce, that under the influence of love the whole disposition of the soul is toward fidelity. Great love absorbs all associations of ideas and thus without conscious exertion intensifies and enlarges the personality. Fidelity will be a necessary condition of love, but a condition whose psychological continuance is not favored by coercive marriage.

Fidelity toward one's self—also in the new sense of the word—thus involves not only the ability in case of need to destroy the bridge between one's self and one's past. It also implies the building of better bridges to strengthen the connection between our personality and our present. It implies not only the capacity to have finished with a destiny; but also that of not having done too soon with a person. It may certainly involve the necessity of a new experiment in life. But still more certainly it involves the need of not allowing the incidental numbness of one's feelings to seduce one to new "experiences." This expression—in place of the old word "adventures"—implies, moreover, an intensification of feeling: where formerly only the excitement of "adventure" was looked for, a richer element of life in now sought. But it is often a fatal error to suppose that this is to be gained in new relations, when on the contrary it might have been won by an intensification of the former ones. By more attention to and respect for the other's personality one may often discover more than one had expected, for some people are like certain landscapes or works of art; they do not begin to make an impression until one thinks one has done with them. But piety is required to await the revelations of soul as of a work. Piety implies contemplation, and this demands peace. But peace is difficult to find in our time, whose misfortune is precisely disturbance and amusement.

That our time like every other has its particular epidemics

in the erotic sphere, is certain, and disturbance is just the condition in which the most dangerous of these find a favorable soil. It is therefore a part of the erotic art of living that a married couple should now and then pass some time undisturbed in each other's company—or separately and alone—in order thus to strengthen the health of their feelings. Here as in other things external precautions against infection are unimportant in comparison with care of the general health.

Only he who, after unceasing effort and patient self-examination, can say that he has used all his resources of goodness and understanding; put into his married life all his desire of happiness and all his vigilance; tried every possibility of enlarging the other's nature, and yet has been unsuccessful—only he can with an easy conscience give up his married life.

Those who thoughtlessly separated, when greater facilities are given, would be the same class of people who now, in coercive marriage, secretly deceive one another. To the serious, divorce will always be serious. Before a person of feeling and thought consciously hurts another who had loved or loves him, he himself has suffered terrible pain. Gratitude for a great devotion in a free connection has often proved more powerfully binding than the law could have been. Nay, to anyone tender of conscience the ties formed by a free connection are stronger than the legal ones, since in the former case he has made a choice more decisive to his own and the other's personality than if he had followed law and custom.

And even when no feelings of affection exercise their retentive power, many people prefer to remain as wreckage on the same shore, rather than be washed away toward a new and uncertain fate.

Human nature is credited with far too great simplicity

and elasticity when it is taken for granted that one experiment in life would succeed another if divorce were free. In this case it is life itself, not the law, which fixes the insurmountable limits. To the deeper natures which have broken away from a life-connection, the pain of it has often been so great as permanently to deaden the colors of life.

In connection with the modern demand for exemption from motherhood we have already rejected the expedient of securing love's freedom through the rearing of children by the State. At the same time the importance and value of the parental home was insisted upon as strongly as possible.

Here, on the other hand, is the place to point out the one-sidedness of the notion that nothing is more important than that the parents should remain together for the sake of the children—since everything must finally depend upon how the parents remain together and what they become through remaining together.

The more degrading cohabitation is to the personality of each parent the less valuable will be the influence for the children of the parental relation.

Only one who sees in marriage a system directly ordained by God, a form of realization of the divine reason, can maintain the proposition that in such a system the good must outweigh human defects. Those who hold that the maintenance of marriage is always the sound and moral course, must take upon themselves the burden of proving that the dull connubial habits of divided mates are a pure source for the origin of new beings; that their mutually conflicting influences are better able to further the welfare of the children than a tranquil bringing-up by one of them; that the happiness of one of them in a new union is more dangerous to the children than his unhappiness in the former one.

To those, on the other hand, who hold the faith of life, the question of the children is always a fresh one in every fresh divorce. Here again we must rise to the conditional judgment, and leave behind the chessboard morality with its equal squares of right and wrong. The danger to the children arising from a divorce depends on all that has gone before and all that comes after. He who dissolves his marriage in the face of his inner consciousness of the harm that the children will thereby suffer, commits a sin which will infallibly be succeeded by the remorse that friends are sometimes eager to adduce as extenuating circumstances. He, on the other hand, who "sins" with an easy conscience has made his choice with the welfare of the children in one scale of the balance. This calm of conscience is then not indifference, and, therefore, does not prevent the possibility of his suffering deeply through the consequences of the decision which he nevertheless does not regret. It may be that in most cases where there are children, the less painful course, even for him who is most convinced of his personal right, is to endeavor to the utmost to preserve a common life which allows the children to grow up under the joint protection of a father and mother, and for the sake of the children to give this life a worthy and kindly character.

In former times, people mended and patched things up endlessly. The psychologically developed generation of the present day is more disposed to allow what is broken to remain broken. For, except in the cases where the cause of rupture has been outward misunderstanding or belated development, patched-up marriages—like patched-up engagements—seldom prove lasting. It has often been profound instincts that caused the rupture; the reconciliation violated these instincts and sooner or later such violation revenges itself.

Thus, it happens, that even exceptional natures have a

greater burden than they can bear, and then it is not the living together but the dying together of their parents that the children witness.

Neither religion nor the law, neither society nor the family, can decide what a marriage kills in a human being or what it may be the means of saving in him. Only he himself knows the one and feels the other. Only he himself can determine how far it may be possible for him to have so far finished with his own existence that he can completely pass into that of his children; to bear the pain of a continued married life so that it may enhance the powers of himself and the children. A mother can do this oftener than a father, but in no case is there any standard that others can use to determine when an excess of suffering is present. More than this, there is strictly no suffering, but only suffering beings who in every case create the suffering anew according to their type of soul.

Only one thing is certain: that no one is more outside the question than the very one who causes the suffering. Thus nothing can be more unreasonable than to leave to the judgment of one of the parties the decision we have just mentioned. The knowledge of being able to refuse a divorce now involves want of consideration for the other's moods of dejection, which would never occur if consideration were necessary to prevent separation. Such attentions are especially significant at the beginning of married life, when most young married people solve the small and great problems of accommodation with more or less difficulty. The birth of the first child, moreover, is often accompanied by abnormal states of feeling, which lead to hasty conclusions as to incompatibility and antipathy. The opponents of free divorce think that it is just during these years that precipitate divorces might take place. But they do not reflect that either partner in his sense of proprietorship now gives himself a loose

rein in a way that would be unthinkable if such security did not exist. Thus the young certainly keep together, but not unfrequently destroy their finest chances of happiness. The need of mutual caution during these dissensions should have a much deeper influence in keeping a couple together than has at present the knowledge that they cannot be free. After the advent of children, the danger is small—except in the case of heartless natures—that a sufferer will too hastily think his powers of endurance are exhausted. The interdependence which children create between their parents when these together care for and love them, is sometimes indissoluble. In most cases it is so strong as to form the real tie, without which laws twice as strict as the present ones would have no power to keep together two unwilling beings.

THE DISCIPLINE OF SEX *

EDWARD SAPIR

Edward Sapir, author of the following article, "The Discipline of Sex," was born in Germany in 1884 and came to the United States when a boy of five years. He was educated in the public schools of Richmond, Virginia, and New York City. He obtained a degree of A.B. from Columbia University and also A.M. and Ph.D. (in Anthropology and Linguistics). Also the honorary degree of D.Sc. was received from Columbia University.

He was chief of Division of Anthropology in the National Museum of Canada from 1910 to 1925, at that time joining the staff of the University of Chicago. At the present time he is Professor of Anthology and general linguistics in the University of Chicago, and has done considerable field work among the various tribes of the United States and Canada.

His published works are as follows: *Language, an Introduction to the Study of Speech,* 1921; *Sound Patterns in Language,* 1925; *A Study in Phonetic Symbolism,* 1929; *Java Texts,* 1910; *Takelma Texts,* 1909; *Wishram Texts,* 1909; *The Takelma Language of Southwestern Oregon,* 1912; *Central and North American Languages,* 1929; *A Sketch of the Social Organization of the Vass River Indians,* 1915; *Time Perspective in Aboriginal American Culture, a Study in Method,* 1916; *Vancouver Island Indians,* 1922; *Culture, Genuine and Spurious,* 1924; *Folk Songs of French Canada* (with Marion Barbeau), 1925; *Anthropology and Sociology; The Unconscious Patterning of Behavior in Society,* 1927; *The Meaning of Religion,* 1928.

We are in the habit of complimenting ourselves on the healthy attitude which is coming to prevail in America toward questions of sex. There is some justification for this, for it is obvious that an attitude that looks upon sex as intrinsically evil, and that seeks to rescue it from condemnation by confining it into conventionally fixed and approved

* Published for the first time in the April, 1929, *American Mercury,* and reprinted in this volume with their kind permission and that of the author.

channels, is a repressive and unhealthy one. But I am not willing to grant, for all that, that the present excited and puzzled attitude, shifting back and forth in a single individual's mind all the way from orthodox acceptance of the restraints of Puritanism to a reasoned religion of promiscuity, is a healthy attitude. The very notion of health implies the presence of a certain balance and of a fundamental surety of the significant outlines of behavior. The most that one can say for the sex mind of radical America is that it is in a state of transition and that a certain willingness to experiment dangerously is in the long run a safer thing than a premature striking of the balance. This may be a just interpretation of the few; of the many, who bless you for a formula for noble weakness, it is but psychology gulled.

A realistic view of actual sex opinion and sex behavior leads to the feeling that on every hand life is being measurably cheapened by an emotional uncertainty in matters of sex, matters that no healthy society can long brook uncertainty of. An individual can create true personal values only on the basis of those accepted by his society, but when nothing is accepted, he has no room for the growth of any values that are more than empty formulæ. The "enrichment of personality" by way of multiple "experiences" proves to be little more than a weary accumulation of poverties. These shibboleths are given the lie by the uneasy eyes of the bored adventurers who drawl them out. Human culture, it seems, is so constituted that the individual dare never face his own organismal responses skeptically. These fundamental responses must somehow be taken care of, by implication, in the patterns of social conduct, and the individual who is constantly being called upon to create such patterns anew never gets beyond the point of struggling with nature. His "freedom" is but the homelessness of the outlaw.

The present sex unrest has been nibbling at more or less

reliable information reported by anthropologists from primitive communities. Any primitive community that indulges, or is said to indulge, in unrestricted sex behavior is considered an interesting community to hear from. Such a community is at once equated with "primitive man" in general and has the great merit of bringing us back to that primary and glorious man that wishful romanticists have always been dreaming about.

It does not seem to occur to the readers of excited books about pleasure-loving Samoans and Trobriand Islanders that perhaps these communities are not as primitive as they seem, that there are perhaps other primitive groups that have developed an ideology of sex that is not so very different from that of our happily extinct Victorian ancestors, and that in any event there may be social determinants in such societies that make the question of value in sex conduct of lesser urgency than among ourselves. It is true that many primitive societies allow of erotic and marital arrangements that shock the sensibilities of our conservatives. But what should be denied is that sex conduct is truly unregulated even in these societies. A closer examination shows that the community has certain very definite ideas as to what is allowable and what is not allowable.

As the conception of the permitted and the illicit, however, in such groups is rarely calculated to interest us unless we happen to be objective students of primitive culture, it is not so obvious why we should think of the licence, or approximate licence, that we read into their sex behavior as of any special concern to us. If we cannot sympathetically understand their sex taboos, why do we pretend to understand their freedom from our sex taboos? Obviously they are in no better case than we ourselves. Historical factors have set certain specific bounds to the expression of the sex impulse in these societies, as they have set more or less

specific bounds in our own, and a primitive reformer who attempted to break down every possible barrier to the free play of sex would receive small comfort from his fellow men.

But it is simply not true that sex freedom is the norm for primitive societies. It is, as a matter of fact, very much the exception, and the presence of sex taboos, of institutionalized deferments of sexual gratification, and of all manner of sex ideals, so far from justifying us in wringing our hands at the perversity of mankind, might more rationally be expected to lead to a psychological inquiry into the reason why human beings have so persistently gone out of their way to put obstacles in the way of the immediate satisfaction of the sex impulse. A certain type of historian is ready with his answer. He tells us that these restrictions have merely come in as a by-product of the conception that women are a form of property. This is one of those theories that are too plausible to be true. The institutionalizing of marriage in terms of property can be amply illustrated in both primitive and sophisticated societies—this no one doubts—but we are far from having the right to take it for granted that ideas of ownership are the root of all sex restrictions. We know too little as yet about the psychological causes of sexual modesty and secrecy, of the universal dread of sex squandering, of the irresistible drive to hedging sex about in one way or another, but we may be certain that these causes are not of a trivial nature and that they are not to be abrogated by a smart and trivial analysis of sex by intellectuals who have more curiosity than intuition.

For reasons which can only be dimly guessed at, man seems everywhere and always to have felt that sex was a quintessential gratification that it was not well to secure at too easy a price, that it held within it sources of power, of value, that could not be rudely snatched. In short, man-

kind has always known that sex needed to be conserved in large part and made over into more than sex. Freud's theory of sublimation has always been man's intuition, and sex has always restlessly striven to become love.

II

Nothing seems more difficult than to convince the all-wise modern that the emotion of love, quite aside from the momentary fulfillment of desire, is one of the oldest and most persistent of human feelings. It is far from being the secondary or adventitiously superimposed thing that it is so often said to be. On the contrary, much that is generally interpreted as primitive, because unromantic, may well be interpreted as a superstructure imposed upon the sex life by considerations of a relatively sophisticated nature—economic, social, religious, or political.

It may be well at this point to relate a brief story which I collected a number of years ago from the Sarcee Indians of Alberta, Canada. The story goes back to the early days, before the Indians were seriously bothered by the white man's morality or his licence. It will seem all wrong to some, for it is nothing but an old-fashioned love story from anywhere and any time.

> Here, once upon a time, they were camped in a circle. They were putting up the Sun Dance.[1] This one young man was making love to her; he and the girl had love for each other. Every time that she came in she would sit down close to where the people were singing and her young man would peep in between the lodge-poles which were leaning against each other.

[1] The Sun Dance is the most important communal ceremonial of the tribes of the Plains, and the most sacred object in the ritual is the center pole of the Sun Dance lodge.

And so it was that his face paint would always be left on the poles.

After a while it was said that they were about to go on the warpath, so this young man went to his sweetheart and said to her, "Do not get lonesome for me. We shall see each other again." And then the girl gave him a little of her hair which she had cut off and she tied it up and they kissed each other and parted. Now they went off to war and the girl's heart dropped.[2]

When the Sun Dance was over, the people broke up camp; they were to come together again at this place at a stated time. They moved off in different directions. Now, as to these people who had gone off on the warpath, they were sighted by the enemy, who sat down in ambush for them. When they got in sight of the enemy, they were attacked and all of them were killed.

After a long time the people came together again at the place that had been mentioned, and when they were all assembled the news was brought that those who had gone off to war had all been killed—so it was said. This girl heard about it. And then she went to the Sun Dance lodge and came here to the place where her sweetheart had been in the habit of peeping in. She saw his face paint on the pole against which he used to lean. And then she returned to her people's lodge and, having arrived there, she took a rope. And then she went back to the Sun Dance lodge and climbed the pole which stood in the center of it. She tied the rope to the pole and looped the other end of it about her neck. And then she sang the song which her sweetheart had been in the habit of singing.

After a while a certain one discovered the girl and

[2] The native equivalent for "she was broken-hearted."

> what she was doing, how she was singing while seated up there on the pole. He spoke of it. They rushed out to her, but before they could reach her she had jumped off and strangled herself with the rope. Though they cut the rope off at once, she was already dead. That is how the girl strangled herself.

This story proves nothing, but it gives pause for thought. It contains all the elements of romantic love and it subjects that romantic love to the final test of all values, which is the test of tragedy. It is not an isolated instance, by any means, though I should not like to be misunderstood as claiming it to be an average or even a typical incident of primitive life or of any other form of life. It is one of those comparatively rare but basically typical examples of the form that a natural value will take in almost any culture if it is supported by an underlying passion which is pure and intense. To speak of frenzy or madness is beside the point, for frenzy is the climactic test of any value.

What is the meaning of this strange passion of love, which crops up at all times and in all places and which the modern rationalist finds it so difficult to allow except as a superficial amplification of the sex drive under the influence of certain conventional ideas and habits? It is as difficult to state clearly what the emotion consists of as it is easy, if one is willing to be but honest for a moment, to comprehend it. The sex nucleus is perfectly obvious and no love that is not built up around this nucleus has psychological reality. But what transforms sex into love is a strange and compulsive identification of the loved one with every kind of attachment that takes the ego out of itself. The intensity of sex becomes an unconscious symbol for every other kind of psychic intensity, and the intensity of love is measured by the intensities of all non-egoistic identifications that have

been transferred to it. It is useless to argue that this is madness. In a sense it is, and we have yet to learn of a value or an ideal that is not potential madness.

Why is it, then, that a sentiment which is as much at home in our despised Victorian yesterday as in the obscure life of a remote Indian tribe needs to be discussed with so much apology today? There is a complex of factors which explains the present temper and we need only examine them to make us realize how transitory is likely to be that temper.

First of all, the old Puritan morality, which looked upon the sex act as inherently sinful, is still too painfully near to us, and the revolt which was bound to set in sooner or later has concentrated all of its energies on the annihilation of this notion of sin. Naturally enough, it has had little patience with the arduous task of retaining that in the inherited ideology of sex which was psychologically sound or, at any rate, capable of preservation as a value without violence to nature. What has happened is that the odious epithet of sin has been removed from sex, but sex itself has not been left a morally indifferent concept. The usual process of overcorrection has invested sex with a factitious value as a romantic and glorious thing in itself. The virus of sin has passed into love, and the imaginative radiance of love, squeezed into the cramped quarters formerly occupied by sin, has transfigured lust and made it into a new and phosphorescent holiness. Love, a complicated and inevitable sentiment, is for the moment sickening for lack of sustenance.

But the anti-Puritan revolt is much more than a revolt against sex repression alone. It is a generalized revolt against everything that is hard, narrow, and intolerant in the old American life, and which sees in sex repression its most potent symbol of attack. Many young men and women of today who declare themselves sexually free are really

revolting against quite other than sex restrictions. They glory in the reputed "sin" because they see it as a challenge to the very notion of repression.

The revolt complex is powerfully strengthened by an insidious influence exerted by modern science. It has been one of the cheerless, yet perfectly natural, consequences of the scientific view of life that nothing in human conduct is supposed to have reality or meaning except in the ultimate physiological terms that alone describe life or are said to describe life to its scientific analyst. If life is nothing but physiology, how can love be other than sex, with such immaterial reinterpretations as no hard-headed modern need take seriously?

Even more important, at least in America, is the great psychological need of the modern woman to extend and make firm her symbols of economic independence. Every attitude and every act that challenges the old doctrine of psychic sex difference is welcomed, no matter where it leads. The most obvious differences of motivation between the sexes are passionately ignored and a whole new mythology has been evolved which deceives only the clever.

The virulence of this reinterpretation of the significance of sex differences is tending to die down, but we are still suffering from the psychological aftermath of the feminist revolt. Who has not met the essentially frigid woman who uses her sex freedom as a weapon with which to feed her ego? And this all too common sacrifice of love and the possibility of love on the altar of an ambition which is essentially insatiable, because it is so much of a compulsion, is met by the complementary need of "fair-minded" men to accept the free woman at her word. Hence the cult of pseudo-nobility, what Wyndham Lewis so aptly calls the new sex-snobbery, which makes an intellectual fetish of freedom and abolishes jealousy by a fiat of the will.

III

The psychological falsity of these attitudes and liberations is manifest enough and leads to a new set of most insidious repressions which owe their origin to the subordination of the natural impulse to reason. It is questionable if these new and hardly recognized repressions, these elaborate maskings of the unconscious by the plausible terminologies of "freedom," of "cumulative richness of experience," of "self-realization," do not lead to an even more profound unhappiness than the more normal subordination of impulse to social conventions that we hear so much about.

The truth of the matter is that in the life of the emotions one can make too few as well as too many demands, and the life of love is naturally no exception to the rule. Men and women who expect too little of each other, who are too nobly eager to grant each other privileges and self-existences that the unconscious does not really want, invite a whole crop of pathological developments. The chronic insistence on the notions of freedom and self-expression is itself contrary to the natural current of the sex life, which flows away from the ego and seeks a realization for the ego which is in a sense destructive of its own claims. Sex as self-realization unconsciously destroys its own object by making of it no more than a tool to a selfish end. There can be no doubt that much modern sex freedom is little more than narcissism, self-love. Applied narcissism, in our particular society, is necessarily promiscuity.

A further consequence of an uncritical doctrine of sex freedom is the lack of true psychological intimacy between lovers and between husband and wife. Abstract freedom is poor soil for the growth of love. It leads to an unacknowledged suspicion and watchfulness and a never-satisfied longing, which in the end kill off the finer and the more sub-

limated forms of passion. The modern man seeks to save the situation by analyzing sex attachment into the fulfillment of sex desire plus such intimacy as constant companionship can give.

This is, of course, totally false psychologically. It is merely a feeble synthesis of dissociated elements arrived at by an inadequate analysis. The easy physical accessibility of the sexes to each other at an early age, the growth of a spurious "pal" spirit between them, with sex itself thrown in as a bride or as a reward—all this, so far from bringing the sexes together in a finer intimacy, has exactly the opposite effect—of leaving them essentially strangers to each other, for they early learn just enough to put a more intuitive seeking and longing stupidly to sleep. Is it any wonder that the sexes unconsciously hate each other today with an altogether new and baffling virulence?

In extreme cases—one dreads to acknowledge how frequent these extreme cases are becoming—the constantly dampened, because never really encouraged, passion between the sexes leads to compensation in the form or homosexuality, which, if we are reliably informed, is definitely on the increase in America. This surely is a strange point of arrival for a gospel of delivery from repression, but it is a perfectly explicable one. Love having been squeezed out of sex, it revenges itself by assuming unnatural forms. The cult of the "naturalness" of homosexuality fools no one but those who need a rationalization of their personal sex problems.

In estimating the significance of the social and psychological currents which are running in the sphere of sex today, it is important to do justice to both cultural and personal factors. It is dangerous to ignore either. Our culture of today is not the creation of the moment, but the necessary continuation of the culture of yesterday, with all

its values. These values need revision, but they cannot be overthrown by any scientific formula. The intellectuals who declare them dead are very much more at their mercy than they care to know. It is not claimed that all individuals can or should make identical adjustments, but in an atmosphere in which no norms of conduct are recognized and no values are maintained, no man or woman can make a satisfactory individual adjustment.

It is peculiarly dangerous in dealing with the sex problem to let petty verbal analogies do the work of an honest analysis. The problem of jealousy is an excellent illustration of this. Owing to the highly individualistic and possessive philosophy of so much of our life, the image of possessiveness has been plausibly but insidiously transferred to the marital relation, finally to the relation of love itself. Sex jealousy is therefore said to imply possessiveness. As one emancipated young woman once expressed it to me, it would be an insult to her and her husband to expect fidelity of either of them. Yet what is more obvious than this—that jealousy can no more be weeded out of the human heart than the shadows cast by the objects of this world can be obliterated by a mechanism that gives them an eternal luminosity? Every joy has its sorrow, every value has its frustration, and the lover who is too noble to be jealous has always been justly suspected by mankind of being no lover at all. It is not the province of men and women to declare out of their intellectual pride what emotions they care to sanction as legitimate or admirable. They can only try to be true to their feelings and to accept the consequences of the fulfillment or denial of these feelings in the terms which nature sees fit to impose.

The supposed equivalence of sex jealousy to the emotion of resentment at the infringement of one's personal property rights is entirely false. Sex jealousy, in its purest form,

is essentially a form of grief, while the combative feeling aroused by theft or other invasion of one's sovereignty is of course nothing but anger. Grief and anger may be intermingled, but only a shallow psychologist will identify them. Perhaps the linguistic evidence is worth something on this point. It is remarkable in how few languages the concept of sex jealousy is confused with the notion of envy. Our use of the English word *jealous* in two psychologically distinct senses has undoubtedly been responsible for a great deal of loose thinking and faulty analysis. It is an insult to the true lover to interpret his fidelity and expectation of fidelity as possessiveness and to translate the maddening grief of jealousy into the paltry terminology of resentment at the infringement of property rights. These crowning psychological absurdities were reserved for the enlightened mentality of today.

IV

We are beginning to understand how much we are swayed in the unconscious by obscure but potent symbolisms. There is a certain logic or configurative necessity about these symbolisms which it is very hard to put into words, but which the intuitively minded feel very keenly. Sex conduct offers singularly potent examples of the importance of such symbolisms and of their arrangement in a series of cumulative values. I refer to the general symbolism of human intimacy.

Every normal individual is unconsciously drawn toward or repelled by another individual, even if the overt contact is but brief and superficial. These feelings of intimacy and withdrawal have their symbolisms in gesture and expression, which differ from individual to individual but tend none the less to take typical forms under the influence of social forces. Of necessity, the most potent symbols of in-

timacy are those that lead to the touching and handling of bodies. To put the matter crudely, we are not in the habit of embracing people to whom we are indifferent and of standing frigidly aloof from those whom we are psychologically intimate with, unless, of course, there is a conflict that paralyzes expression.

Now, of all known forms of intimacy among human beings the sex relation is naturally the most far-reaching. It necessarily takes its place in the unconscious series of symbolisms of intimacy as the most valued and the final symbol of all. I do not claim that all human beings are equally sensitive to symbolisms of this sort, but there is enough of a psychological common ground in most of us to make it impossible for the normal person to transgress the unformulated laws of symbolic expression beyond a certain point.

It is exceedingly likely, it seems to me, that the obscure, though of course unacknowledged, feeling of shame felt by prostitutes and by those who indulge in promiscuity is by no means entirely due to the fact that they transgress the social code, laying themselves open to a conventional censure. It is likely that this shame is also in large part the resultant of an elusive feeling that a natural scale of values is being transgressed because the expressions which are their symbols are, by implication, arranged in a psychologically impossible sequence. In a deeply symbolic sense, then, the prostitute is "illogical," and her only psychological escape is to refuse to identify herself with her body. And it is no mere accident that so many of the protagonists of sex freedom despise their own bodies.

In sober fact the erotic landscape in contemporary America is by no means as depressing as these observations may lead one to believe. I have wanted to point out the psychological fallacies in the contemporary cult of sex free-

dom and the ultimate implications of those fallacies rather than to give an accurate description of contemporary sex life. Sex irregularities, while numerous, are not necessarily so indicative as they seem to be of the deeper-lying set of our erotic philosophy. Unless I sadly misread the *mores* of America, there are many reassuring signs that the reign of so-called Puritan morality is not likely to come to a sudden end even among the sophisticated and that, while the negative elements of that morality are sure to be cast aside by the intelligent and their rigor mitigated by all, its essential core will survive.

Europe may laugh and shrug its shoulders but America can be shockingly stubborn on what she feels to be the fundamentals of life. It would be nothing short of a cultural disaster if America as a whole surrendered to continental European feeling and practice. With religion in none too healthy a state and with the æsthetic life rudimentary and imitative, America needs an irrational faith in the value of love and of fidelity in love as perhaps no other part of the occidental world needs it today.

The moral atmosphere in America is only superficially similar to that of continental Europe. One of the surest signs of the essential difference in outlook is the rapidly increasing divorce rate. Bewailed by domestic moralists and deplored by our European visitors, the ease of obtaining divorce in America is actually an indication of our restless psychological health. Were the institution of marriage and the family actually divorced in sentiment from the sphere of sex indulgence, there would be no reason why a tolerance of marital infidelity should not come to be accepted in America as it has long been in France. But anyone who imagines that America can with a clear conscience settle down to the reasonable and gracious distribution of individual pleasures and familial ceremonies that seems to suit

the French genius knows very little about the American temper.

The very youthful intellectuals who are clamorous in their determination to "go the limit" are unable in practice to "play the game," for they cannot learn the rules. Do what one will, sex relations in America have a way of calling up romantic images and implications of fidelity that make this country seem a mysterious, an incredible, realm to the emancipated foreigner. Incompatibility of husband and wife of necessity leads more speedily to divorce than in sophisticated Europe. I am leaving Russia out of the picture, for we know too little about the psychological realities of contemporary Russia to speak of it with profit.

Closely connected with this stubborn unwillingness of the typical American to save marriage and the integrity of the family at the cost of erotic honesty is his peculiar unwillingness or inability to make a fine art of sex indulgence. The "kick" of sex freedom in America lies precisely in its being "sin," not an honest way of life. Americans make poor Don Juans. Nor does the graceful and accomplished *hetaira* of French life seem to flourish on our stubborn soil. Many young women have tried the part but even the most successful of our amateurs in the erotic arts seem compelled by the very nature of the culture in which they have been reared to pay a heavy price. Our intellectual mistresses of sin play a sadly pedantic part, their ardors are in the head rather than in the heart zone.

To put it bluntly, the "free" woman of sophisticated America, whether poetess or saleslady, has a hard job escaping from the uncomfortable feeling that she is really a safe, and therefore a dishonest, prostitute. The charge seems unreasonable to the mind, but the spirit cannot wholly throw off the imputation. The battle shows in the hard, slightly unfocussed, glitter of the eye and in the hollow laugh. And

one can watch the gradual deterioration of personality that seems to set in in many of our young women with the premature adoption of the new sophisticated sex standards.

Psychiatrists have often burned their fingers in this matter and perhaps there is nothing they need to keep more steadily in mind than that in proffering advice in matters of sex they are addressing themselves not merely to intelligence and to desire but to certain obscure and unacknowledged values that cannot be flouted with impunity. If they are of foreign birth and culture, it would be well for them to take a little more seriously some of the "resistances" they encounter and to ponder, on occasion, the possibility that in exploding a personal "complex" they may incidentally be shattering an "ideal." That American men and women coarsen on a fare that seems to agree with the sophisticates of the Old World is both a warning and a reason for optimism. It points the way to a reaction of feeling that Europe will not understand.

V

Americans tend, in the most disconcerting way, to be both realistic and conservative in the matter of sex. That psychological health demands sex satisfaction at a much earlier period than the general postponement of marriage makes possible is coming to be generally recognized. It is clear, however, that a true tolerance for illicit relationships of a promiscuous sort is not likely to become prevalent. Such suggested institutions as the companionate marriage lead one rather to suspect that America is feeling its way toward a loosening of the institutional rigors and responsibilities of marriage by the growth of new types of sex relationship.

It is difficult to say just what is likely to emerge from the present period of unrest and experimentation, but one

thing seems certain. America will not be a docile pupil of Europe, and the sophisticates of this country who are taken in by the apparently easy solutions of their European brethren, whom they so vainly admire, are likely to find themselves in a strangely unsympathetic clime. That new institutions of an erotic and marital nature are slowly maturing is obvious. It is my belief that it is no less obvious that these institutions, whatever their forms may be, will not mean a surrender to licence but will have for their object, however obscurely and indirectly, the saving of love and the perpetuation of romantic intimacy and of the ideal of fidelity by those who are capable of this intimacy. And it is more likely than not that the average American, for a long time to come, will have the delusion, if it is nothing else, that he is capable of just this experience.

PROMISCUITY AND THE SOCIAL ORDER *

SIR ARTHUR NEWSHOLME

Sir Arthur Newsholme, K.C.B., Vice-President of The British Social Hygiene Council, Inc., is one of the distinguished medical men, not only of England, but of the world. He has been a member of innumerable commissions and was late lecturer on Public Health at Johns Hopkins University. He was President of the Society of Medical Officers of Health, 1901—Examiner in Public Health at the University of Cambridge and in State Medicine in the University of London. Also Examiner of Preventive Medicine at the University of Oxford. He was made Companion of the Bath in 1912 and was knighted in 1917 for his distinguished services. He was also a member of the Council of Imperial Cancer Research.

Among his publications are numbered: *The Alleged Increase in Cancer,* 1895; *The Spread of Enteric Fever by Means of Sewage-Contaminated Shellfish,* 1896; *Epidemic Diphtheria,* 1898; *Prevention of Phthisis,* 1899; *Prevention of Tuberculosis,* 1908; *The Co-ordination of the Medical Services,* 1907; *American Addresses on Health and Insurance,* 1920; *The Evolution of Preventive Medicine,* 1927; *The Ministry of Health,* 1925; *The Story of Modern Preventive Medicine,* 1929; etc.

If the teaching of history is to have weight, it must be accepted that promiscuity in the sense of casual sexual congress is the chief enemy of the social order, as well as the main source of the great scourges of humanity, syphilis and gonorrhea.

This is so, among other reasons, because the relationship is merely material, the purchase and sale of a human body, which degrades men and women below the level of animals, especially of those animals in whom there is definite and

* Published in *Foundations of Social Hygiene,* by The British Social Hygiene Council, Inc., Carteret House, Westminster, S. W. 1, and reprinted with the consent of both the author and the Council.

continued family life. The arguments against promiscuity apply to a modified extent to irregular unions which are non-mercenary, but in the breaking of which cruelty to one partner is commonly involved, and a trend toward promiscuity initiated. The personal and social reasons for pre-marital chastity and post-marital continence and faithfulness have been stated in an admirable article by Miss Alison Neilans, of the Association for Moral and Social Hygiene, which is utilized in the following summary:

Among the personal reasons the first is that illicit relations are a sin against love. Sex needs to be placed before adolescents and adults, not as animal and even disgusting, but as the physical basis of ideal love, the theme of the chief romance of life, and the power which links us with God as conscious creators. The illicit relations are a sin against our own self-respect. The furtive shifts and the secrecy of such relations introduce an element of dishonesty into life. There is anxiety and disharmony in the entire relationship which react unfavorably on mind and on character.

Illicit relations are contrary to our intuitive sense of right. Apart from state or religious authority or convention, most persons intuitively realize that sex is a serious matter and that regret and remorse follow when we fall below our subconscious ideals.

The effect of incontinence on the partner in the relation is degrading. Individual remorse is or should be the fate of one who is responsible for the demoralization of another. A supremely great need is the increasing cultivation of public opinion and conscience, which will destroy the differing view of male and female incontinence. A woman's honor is regarded as her greatest possession, but there is still widespread failure to realize that he is a dastard who deprives her of this possession or who encourages her continuance in an irregular life.

The effect on present or future wife, apart from the possible conveyance of disease, is deplorable. It is the last insult to a wife in the words of St. Paul to "make her members the member of a harlot"; and the conditions of durability and success of happy married life are endangered when one of the partners fails to bring to it the attribute of chastity.

On the community a serious injury is inflicted by irregular unions, even when mutual love is involved; for one such union is commonly replaced by another, and this is a frequent beginning of promiscuity, and for the woman of prostitution.

Every adult, furthermore, has a serious responsibility to aid the prevalence of a high standard of sexual conduct, not only for the security of the present generation, but also on behalf of racial quality. This motive of race continuity has not been adequately stressed. Mankind may learn something in this respect even from the fishes which undertake a perilous migration to their spawning place, leaping weirs and traversing shallow brooks, that their progeny may start life in the most favorable circumstances.

The Double Moral Standard

A chief obstacle to reform, and a chief reason why improvement through the ages has been so slow, is, as has already been indicated, the double social standard, which regards sexual irregularity as a venial offense in one sex and a serious one in the other sex. With the spread of knowledge of contraceptives and the increasing replacement of the professional prostitute by the unpaid woman, it is clear that without male chastity female unchastity must become more frequent; that if men do not raise their standard of conduct, it will necessarily be lowered for an increasing number of women. There is an evident need of spiritual motives for sexual self-control. For, as stated by Miss Neilans:

> The penalty of giving rein to irresponsible sexual impulse is not necessarily venereal disease; the penalty is that the man or woman who does so is thwarting and starving his best self, and in consequence is torn with conflicting desires: the social and spiritual nature pulling in one direction and the animal and self-seeking nature in the other.

Robert Burns well expressed this when he wrote of roving sensual passion:

> But och! it hardens a' within
> And petrifies the feeling.

A number of questions have been propounded in the preceding pages, and have either remained unanswered or have received only suggestions of answers. Even so, it is well to be faced with the essential considerations. Thus, we have asked in what direction can we act to supplement and steadily to render less necessary present official hygienic and medical measures for the control of venereal diseases? The answer is through the general adoption of sexual morality in the communal interest. But is the necessarily high standard of conduct which is needed practicable for the majority of people? A partial answer is suggested in the slow forces which have instituted family life and the altruism which is implied in it; and the widening distribution of the desire to secure the welfare of strangers as well as of neighbors and of one's own family and especially the passion for the welfare of the child give further hope, which notwithstanding some sinister features is confirmed by the historical evidence of increasing regard for sexual morality as the centuries proceed.

But the progress toward the moral ideal has been terribly slow, and the diseases resulting from contravention of this ideal have never been even partially controlled prior to the

active medical measures which were organized in this country on a national scale in the year 1916. Our final questions, then, are how can this partial medical control, which is all that medicine can supply, be rendered less and less necessary by measures which will diminish sexual irregularities and so make medical and non-moral hygiene superfluous?

We need not despise medical measures. They are our first line of attack in present circumstances, and are doing incalculable good. Nor can we today desire to encourage a high standard of sexual conduct by inflicting disease as a punishment for departure from this standard. For this reason, official medical measures in the interest of the community are making even promiscuity less prone to inseminate disease, while carefully guarding against responsibility for or partnership in this promiscuity. But, as already stated, possibilities are limited in this direction; and our efforts must be directed into further channels if the maximum good is to be achieved.

Much further action is practicable by extensions of our present medical services and by social work in connection with these. There has been considerable neglect of present opportunities for the treatment of congenital syphilis and of the parents of such patients. To discuss other feasible lines of advance on medical lines is impracticable in this paper.

Law Enforcement

In enforcement of law there is scope for increased activity, and our social duty necessitates continuous vigilance in securing the election on Watch or Police Committees of those who will see that present laws against vice are impartially and fully enforced. If members of the public continue to decline to give evidence in such cases, they become partially responsible for the continuance of vice. A Departmental Committee has been asked for on the laws of solicitation, and it

may be hoped that it will be appointed and will report against the folly of finding prostitutes for this offense, and thus making it necessary for them to ply their trade with increased assiduity. At present the law enables the occupier of the house in which prostitution occurs to be prosecuted, but the principals to the act go unpunished. The barter of sex is an anti-social act always and everywhere. Should it not be the duty of the State to declare such an act illegal? To place such an inhibition on the statute book would greatly facilitate the reduction of the coarser forms of commercialized vice. A more rigid definition of brothel is needed, and the prohibition of the use of hotels and lodging houses for prostitution is called for. It may be urged parrot-wise that this is driving the evil underground, but experience has demonstrated that vice is diminished by rendering it more difficult. It is supremely important to convince the average mind that real good is done by reducing the temptations to vice. A great social need is an increase in the number of social workers attached to police courts, who will get into sympathetic touch with sexual offenders, and secure their treatment medically and socially. Divorce has important bearings on the prevention of venereal diseases. Where the integrity of family life has been broken, for instance, by the penal servitude of the husband, by prolonged and apparently incurable insanity, or by desertion continued over a series of years, divorce should be practicable. Such proposals offend the views of many; but divorce given for these reasons is preferable to the sexual irregularities which commonly are the alternative, and it may be hoped that Churchmen while retaining their own convictions will become willing to give liberty to persons desiring divorce when the need for this is indicated in the communal interest.

The protection of feeble-minded persons by segregation is urgently needed, but this can be given only when the com-

munity is willing to provide the institutional provision for such persons, which at present is lamentably deficient.

Economics of Marriage

The encouragement of early marriages opens up a wide field for discussion as to the possibility of a less luxurious standard of life, as to taxation in relation to marriage and the size of the family, and as to the encouragement of the study of cookery and domestic management as important accomplishments for the success of married life.

It is not possible to discuss here the economic difficulties which lead to postponement of marriage or to its being out of the question. The difficulty of securing house accommodation is a further intricate problem which I think will only be solved when, in addition to change in the industrial factors of profiteering and inefficiency of work, we are determined to spend a larger proportion of our total income on rents, diverting expenditure from alcoholic drinks and other superfluous expenses.

But when every aid to conduct which is socially ethical has been provided, the essential problem is how we can cultivate the character of each child and adolescent so as to render sexual offenses against the community exceptional. The best of heathendom and Christianity always have voiced the universal experience of the grave danger to the spiritual self of uncontrolled sex-impulse, and the need for assistance from religious as well as other motives in the strengthening and developing of what is best in man. In attaining this end, every approach needs to be utilized, biological, psychological, ethical and religious.

Biology reminds us of our origin, and should make us merciful in our judgment of the many who lag behind in moral progress.

Physiology gives a further reason for mercy in judgment,

in our increasing knowledge of the chemical correlations of the endocrine glands, the individual precocity, retardation and acuity of passion varying in accordance with their activity, though in most people within a relatively small range. We know too much to justify our regarding ourselves as ever being the merely helpless victims of these glands; but these physiological differences confirm the need for charitable judgment.

Power of Public Opinion

A study of society shows that social groupings necessarily impose rigid limitations on animal impulses, and these are especially enforced by the community in respect of the physiological acts leading to reproduction. By such restrictions conduct is made to conform with the prevailing standard of the community; and apart from any higher sanction, it is the praise or blame of associates which gives the standard of "right" for the individual code. Hence it follows that our chief line of social safety in sex matters consists in the cultivation by every legitimate method of right public opinion. In moral matters public opinion is more important than the legislative or executive restrictions which may make this opinion obligatory. But the objection to compulsion in moral restraint *per se* is inconsistent with the teaching of history and with the experience of our own times: though, when it comes to questions like restrictions on indecent pictures, on pornographic novels, on plays in which—alas! too often—the ideal is not that of married love, and on unhealthy cinematographs, one must remember that people get what they desire; and unless those who desire clean wholesome literature and plays become persistently vocal and show that indecency in motive or in plot does not pay, these obstacles to clean life will continue to be rampant. We may well remember that although the gutter and the sewer play

a part in real life, we are not bound to wallow in them. Would that some of our popular novelists would remember this!

Ethical Control

But the moral and spiritual attitude constitutes the hope for the future; and this is only possible if it is cultivated. The study of psychology and its application in the training of the young gives the means to the development of the necessary control over instinctive tendencies. Apart, furthermore, from the unknown allowance required by the varying extent to which endocrine functions modify the individual problem, the directive forces arising from the herd and community life give the "conditional stimuli for the development of social control or organization of our primitive or animal impulses" (Dunham). These forces include the whole of the educational influences of life. Now that we know that not only can intelligence be measured in part, but also—what is more important—that our impulses (appetites) and attitudes (feelings) can be analyzed, there are opened out ways of recognizing and utilizing the play of these fundamental forces in the formation of character. The study of human emotions and the cultivation of their control is indispensable for ideal human life, and, it may be added, is equally necessary for making democracy safe for the world.

Man's ethical, his mental, or his physical nature may be defective, with corresponding defects of character, of intelligence or of health. It is necessary always to remember that the three can seldom be entirely separated. In a legitimate sense "mental" means not only "intellectual" but also "moral"; and the best psychology is embodied in the words, "Keep thy heart with all diligence, for out of it are the issues of life."

Conduct must be judged in relation to the benefit of the

entire community, and it is for this reason that natural sexual impulses have been subjected to some measure of regulation from the earliest ages, and that we condemn increasingly the satisfaction of passion without the range of society's institutions. Conduct being the resultant of character, and character the product of feelings, desires, control, interest, attitude, mood, sentiment, etc., sin may be defined in Dunham's words as "the deliberate failure to interpret an impulse with a view to confirm or to increase the instinctive integration of character."

The psychological training of character in the home, the school, and in social and industrial circumstances cannot be discussed here.

I may, however, be permitted to suggest several practical lines on which valuable aid in the cultivation of conduct is practicable.

Our elementary and secondary schools already take a momentous part in the development of individual character. In relation to sexual hygiene what can be more important than the adoption of the following measures, or their extension if already partially in operation?

(1) That educational authorities should give facilities to teachers to attend special courses of lectures on social hygiene and ethics, including the payment of their traveling expenses when necessary.

(2) That educational authorities should lend school buildings for conferences between teachers and parents on the same subject.

(3) That the Board of Education should issue a special syllabus, possibly also a handbook, on social hygiene and character training, on similar lines to the existing syllabus on the teaching of hygiene and temperance.

(4) That in all secondary schools steps should be

taken to secure the teaching of biology, including physiology and hygiene, in which might very properly be introduced teaching as to the responsibilities of family life and parenthood.

Much can be done by direct teaching of the young in schools. But it is necessary:

(5) That Government and other large employers should be roused to a sense of their moral responsibility for the adolescent youths and girls employed by them. Some Government Departments have declined to give facilities for addresses on social hygiene to their employees, while others have agreed. Evidently public opinion is needed to alter this and to minimize the risks of moral corruption when large numbers of young people are aggregated without wise direction.

An important further point in connection with the local work of the British Social Hygiene Council is to remember:

(6) That its work of special propaganda is most valuable when it is associated with the steady teaching of adolescent effort to place ethical on an equal footing with intellectual training.

"Hot air" spasmodic efforts are not likely to lead to permanent improvement, and furthermore, it is certain:

(7) That *ad hoc* educational effort directed solely to sexual hygiene is relatively ineffective. Now that local authorities possess power to spend money on all branches of public health education, it will become practicable for public health and educational authorities to combine in the general cultivation of higher standards of life, sexual hygiene then taking its place with other branches of teaching directed toward self-control as affecting

health. This joint responsibility of education and public health authorities for adolescents extends to the provision of adequate recreative facilities; and in this connection there is opened out a vast sphere of communal activity which can be made to bear abundant fruit in improved morality as well as in better health.

The possibilities of character training are enormous, not only in the special directions suggested above, but also even more in the daily interference which takes place with the freedom of egoistic motives from infancy onward, and in the necessary clashing between animal appetites and the conscience, or intuitive self-analysis, which in children brought up satisfactorily "hath a thousand several tongues" of guidance and warning. All this implies struggle and conflict in life. Morality, in fact, means victory over nature. It appears inevitable that in man's slow ascent the price of higher satisfaction is some crucifixion of spontaneous desires, and we can, I think, aver that in making up our ledger of happiness the gain is on the side of higher ideals and conduct. There must be sacrifice in some measure for all. For the anti-social whose egoism blocks the road of progress it becomes more or less obligatory, for others it represents a real gain in fullness of life. In respect of all human endeavors there is the natural road and the ethical. We may abandon hope, as J. A. Spender has put it, "if we cannot believe that the 'natural' is under control." We must, as Lord Grey said in another connection, "learn or perish"; learn to maintain and to raise our standard of moral character, or fall like ancient Greece and Rome did, after they had become the moral sewers of the nations. The community cannot prosper in essentials and cannot survive in health without morality. Morality means personal conduct which in every respect is favorable to the welfare of the community.

But the survival of the individual is dependent on community organization. And we thus arrive at what may be regarded as the harsh conclusion that sexual morality being required for the welfare of the community, those for whom marriage is impracticable on the highest grounds are required to sublimate their passion by processes of reëducation, diverting the energy arising from instinctive conflicts toward art, service, religion and other cultural interests. The value of play and recreation, of various forms of social entertainment converging to this end is well known. Such sublimation is needed by all of us in varying degrees, and the science and arts of community life will in the future be increasingly concerned in various endeavors to supply adequate æsthetic, recreational and social outlets for the young, especially between the ages of fifteen and thirty.

It will have been seen: (1) I consider that the control of venereal diseases should become more and more a question of organizing public opinion and action against irregular sex relations, which for practical purposes are solely responsible for these diseases, though I would press for extensions of the medical measures against these diseases which have already had a large measure of success.

(2) That I do not consider any short-cut to freedom from these diseases likely to have marked success, and I regard the general and public advocacy of prophylaxis in irregular sex relations as inimical to the moral progress by means of which, in conjunction with present and extended medical measures, we shall eventually render these diseases a shadow of their present self.

(3) That, although there is evidence of increasing sexual laxity in some circles, history shows a marvelous improvement in this respect as compared with the past. I do not believe that the experience of men and women "about town," or the prurient studies of some popular novels, are con-

sistent with the experience of the mass of our people, for whom happily sexual experience begins with marriage, or never begins at all.

(4) That in recent years and especially in the last decade, notwithstanding the terrible sexual lapses during the Great War, the hope of controlling venereal diseases has become increasingly bright.

(5) That much good can be made to result from the greater frankness with which sexual problems are now discussed; for although this may be regarded as implying an "eclipse of modesty," it can also bring about a realization that, as Professor Arthur Thomson has put it, "Sex at its best is like religion at its best, a reaction of the whole organism, heart, hand and head."

(6) That the teaching of sex hygiene is important, always, if possible, as part of general physiology and hygiene, although its importance is subsidiary to the teaching indicated in paragraph (8).

(7) That there is profound need for the pressure of public opinion in favor of clean talking and clean writing. The mother's endeavor to teach her boy the sacredness of his own body and "reverence for the channel of motherhood," is made ineffective if we do not discourage the common sniggering when this subject is mentioned, or its treatment in newspapers in a manner which, as Havelock Ellis puts it, implies that "the sacred temple is treated as a common sewer."

(8) That character training is the most important, but the most neglected, part of our educational system, from the cradle to the university. The object of education, from our present point of view, is to conform the child's reason to that of the community. To this end it is necessary to liberate and organize all the instinctive and emotional powers of each person under the guidance of a rational and ideal

purpose. This purpose should include the golden rule of the gospel, and become an extended altruism which even already is being partially appreciated. This realizes and tries to embody in action that we are links in the chain of time, an essential part of one function in life being to "pass on the torch of life undimmed and steadier."

(9) That for some members of the community the accidents and mishaps of matrimonial life, and for others a necessarily celibate life, will call for a higher sacrifice. We are all members one of another, and communal welfare cannot be secured without repetitions of the Crucifixion in every generation.

SEX AND THE PHYSICIAN *

A. A. BRILL

Dr. A. A. Brill was born in Austria on October 12, 1874, the son of Philip and Esther Brill. In 1908 he married Rose Owen of New York City.

He was formerly Assistant Physician at the Central Islip State Hospital and in the Clinic of Psychiatry of Zurich. Also Chief of Clinic in Psychiatry at Columbia University and Lecturer on Psycho-analysis and Abnormal Psychology in New York University. At the present time he is a Lecturer at Columbia University on psycho-analysis and the psychosexual sciences.

His published works are as follows: *Psycho-analysis: Its Theories and Application; Fundamental Conceptions of Psycho-Analysis;* Translations: *Freud's Selected Papers on Hysteria; Three Contributions to the Theory of Sex* (Freud); *Freud's Interpretation of Dreams; Psychopathology of Everyday Life; Wit and Its Relation to the Unconscious; Leonardo da Vinci; The History of the Psycho-analytic Movement; Totem and Taboo; Reflections on War and Death.*

It is a well-known fact that we are more interested now in problems of sex than we were, let us say, twenty or twenty-five years ago. It is also true that psychiatrists have always had to cope with the adjustment of sexual problems more often than the average practitioner, for it is in the nature of the psychosis to express itself frankly and compel attention to its problems. It was not, however, until the advent of psychoanalysis that even psychiatrists became aware of the seriousness, or, I might say, the existence of sex as a psycho-

* This chaptre *Sex and the Physician* was first published in the November, 1929, issue of *The Urologic and Cutaneous Review,* St. Louis, Mo., and is reprinted with the permission of the publishers and author.

logical problem. When Professor Freud first told us that we have to examine the sexual life of a person because of the great part it plays in his neurotic ailments, we were surprised to find that we had much to learn about the nature of the sex instinct in general. I recall what a meager knowledge of sexology I possessed even when I was an assistant physician in a hospital for the insane. To be sure, I had read Kraft-Ebbing's *Psychopathia Sexualis* and a volume or two of Havelock Ellis, but just as with many others it was more a question of sexual curiosity than a search for knowledge. Yet, the State Hospital offered plenty of material and many opportunities for the study of psychosexual problems. Very frequently attention had to be focussed on problems of sex because the patients would thrust them at us. Thus I was forced to take a scientific interest in homosexuality when I accidentally found a patient who was in the hospital solely because of his sexual perversion; he presented no psychosis whatsoever. As soon as I began to delve into the literature I discovered that I knew nothing of the emotional and psychical elements of sex, for neither the schools of medicine nor the textbooks paid any attention to anything but the organic ailments of the sexual organs. I am sure that I was no exception in my ignorance of psychosexuality, for when later I began to talk before medical societies and stress Professor Freud's ideas of sex, the bizarre, not to say stupid, remarks I heard even from psychiatrists and neurologists left no doubt in my mind that psychosexuality was a *terra incognita* in medicine, especially in the United States.

But as soon as we begin to take sex seriously, and recognize its importance in the psyche, we are confronted with a great many difficult problems. For over twenty-five years I have been listening to sex problems and assisting in their solutions, often unwittingly, for sex usually encroaches upon all our social and ethical institutions into which one hesitates to

venture. To be sure I had no inkling of these difficulties until I suddenly found myself in the midst of them. Let me recall my first experience. In 1909, when I was already actively engaged in psychoanalytic work, a young journalist of my acquaintance consulted me about his nineteen-year-old brother, a college student, who had been obsessed with morbid sexual phantasies for more than a year. Formerly a very good student, now he could read nothing without mixing into it some sex phantasies. He continually became more and more distressed over it, so that he was finally forced to open his heart to the Dean of his college, who referred him to a neurologist. The latter gave him a usual sermon about the harmful consequences of sex, advised diversion through athletics and last, but not least, exhorted him to use his will power—advice and admonition which only served to enhance this young man's burdens. The older brother who was liberal in his views thought that it would be best to take his brother to a brothel "and be done with it." He reasoned that to save his brother from failure, into which he was clearly gravitating because of a lack of sexual outlet, sexual relations would surely help. He presented these ideas to me; I reflected upon them and felt that his suggestion could do no harm, particularly as I was assured that the moral aspects did not come into consideration. A few months later this young student was brought to my office and then I realized that this remedy not only did not cure him but had involved him in all sorts of additional conflicts. It was the first time in my private practice that I was confronted with the seriousness of advising in sexual matters, and after mature reflection I came to the conclusion that notwithstanding the great ignorance of sex, the average normal person learns how to adjust sexually despite all difficulties and seeks no advice from doctors, and that those who are so involved in their sex conflicts as to need outside help, are

usually neurotics or psychotics whose sexual conflicts are superficial expressions of mental and emotional disturbances. They are in need of a thorough psychic adjustment which can be accomplished only through prolonged treatment. Their pathological sexual struggles plainly show that they are unfit for normal sexual relation. Coitus has never cured any neurosis.

Nevertheless, even with this attitude in mind, we still have to deal with our patient's psychosexual life and once we begin to study it we find that sex is most intimately associated with the psyche and that it cannot be dealt with as an isolated physical disturbance in the same manner as gonorrhea or lues. Thus when I began to study the aforementioned patient's sexual phantasies, I could see clearly why they obsessed him to such an extent and why coitus, which is only one element of our cultural sex life, could not cure him. Unfortunately, I can present here only isolated fragments of this and other cases and in order to be understood I must return for a while to my rôle as a Freudian expositor.

According to Professor Freud, the sex instinct in the broad sense consists of many components and partial impulses which are usually not associated with sex. Sex comprises the whole love life of the individual. Professor Freud thought it best to put all these components and impulses into the concept of Libido, in which he includes the somatic as well as the psychic and emotional elements of sex, such as the love for parents, friendships, love of country, and sometimes even the profound emotional feelings for an abstract idea. Moreover, in order to understand disorders of the psychosexual life, one must have some concept of its evolution. In the physical spheres we speak of a general diathesis or of a *locus minoris resistentiæ,* and that as a result of accidental and constitutional factors the individual shows a sort of

predilection for this or that malady, or symptom complex. From Professor Freud we know that the same is true of the psychic spheres; here, too, we must consider constitutional and accidental factors. Given a neurosis or psychosis we can find its source of origin in some *locus minoris resistentiæ* which we designate as a fixation or weak spot in the person's psychosexual evolution. As will be shown later, fixations result from a trauma or traumata, to one or more of the components or partial impulses of the sex life which occur during the infantile sexual period. For according to Professor Freud the infantile sexuality begins with birth and manifests itself in a desire on the part of the child to obtain pleasure from various parts of the body (erogenous zones) such as the mouth, anus, skin and muscular system.[1] The characteristic of the infantile sexual life is its wide diffusion in contrast to the adult sexuality, where everything is more or less centralized in the genital regions. For Professor Freud [2] recognizes three phases in the psychosexual development of man, (1) The autoerotic, from birth to about four years; (2) the latency period, from that age to about eight or nine years, and (3) the pubescent, or the period of *object libido* when the child develops into a man or woman and manifests a definite attitude toward persons of the opposite sex. As said above, impediments and traumas, especially during the first period of childhood, result in fixations to which the person may later regress, if for some reason he is unable to express his libidinous strivings in normal paths. The symptoms then point to what fixation he regressed. Thus the characteristic emotional tone of the first period is self-sufficiency. The child obtains all outlets from himself and his mother whom he still conceives as a part of himself. His earliest

[1] Freud, "Three Contributions to the Theory of Sex," translated by Brill, Monograph Series of the *Journal of Nervous and Mental Diseases.*
[2] *Ibid.*

outlets are mainly restricted to nutrition and excretion and it is through these functions, oral and anal-urethral, that the child manifests his first likes and dislikes or pleasures and displeasures. They represent the first ego-organizations. Gradually, however, he takes more interest in his environments, his needs increase, so that his mother can no longer supply them all, and by the age of four or five, he already shows a distinct need for some objects of the outer world. This is clearly seen in his behavior toward toys, his continuous striving for independence, and in his general adjustment to reality. At the age of four the normal child has given up most of his infantile traits such as abnormal aggression (cruelty), immodesty (exhibitionism) and coprophilic interests, and reacts against them with sympathy, shame, morality and disgust, the so-called cultural dams which distinguish the civilized being from the savage or animal. All the primitive components and impulses with which he was endowed by nature are then partially sublimated and the rest is placed under the primacy of the genitals. A certain amount of aggression, looking and touching, etc., is perfectly normal and necessary for the attainment of the object in self-preservation and preservation of the species (hunger and love). For the aim of all higher living beings is, first, to sustain himself and, second, to find a mating partner. In the human being the progress toward this goal is not so direct and continuous as in the lower species. There seems to be a period of latency, so far as sexual functioning is concerned, between the autoerotic period and puberty; during this period the individual seems to be uninterested in sexual matters. In all probability this sexual latency period, which is characteristic to mankind only, is an inheritance from the glacial epoch, and, one might say, serves to prepare the civilized child for his future life. For it is the beginning of school age when the child first comes into contact with the realities

of the outer world and receives there in condensed form the experiences of the whole past of mankind. But just before or at the beginning of the latency period when the infantile sexuality has undergone partial repression and sublimation, and the various components and partial impulses gather into one stream on their way to *object libido,* there is a stage of evolution between the ages of four and five years, during which the individual finds himself as the first object of his search; he becomes aware of himself as an interesting personality and falls in love with himself as it were. Professor Freud designates this as the narcissistic phase of development, following the Greek myth of Narcissus. The ego which reaches the highest degree of development at this age is thereafter continually combated by the forces of the outer world, with which it later comes in constant contact. But the individual never gives up his egotistic tendencies altogether, except, perhaps, for short transitory periods when he is at the height of being in love. However, a strong fixation in the autoerotic period may not only continue or revive self-adequate mechanisms, such as chronic masturbation with conflicts, and pathological introspection with shut-inness, but it may cause a full regression of autoerotism, or schizophrenism. Similarly, fixations in the narcissistic period with a subsequent regression to it may result in homosexuality and paranoia.[8]

These evolutionary divisions, though not always clear-cut, can be readily discerned and are of great help in our study of abnormal manifestations, in which we include not only extreme deviations from the aim and object, such as perversions and inversions, but also the seemingly slight sexual maladjustment in the patient's psychosexual life. For besides

[8] For further elucidation of this problem the reader is referred to Chapters X and XI of *Psychoanalysis, Its Theories and Application,* by Brill.

the resultant injuries from accidental factors (fixations) one must also think of constitutional factors such as congenital bisexuality. About twelve years ago a physician consulted me about his four and one-half-year-old nephew. The doctor and family noticed that this little boy showed a distinct tendency to effeminacy. He preferred to play with little girls, shunned the company of boys, preferred dolls to games of aggression and whenever possible he adorned himself with colored ribbons. This boy was the last of six children; he was the result of an accident eight years after his older brother was born. His oldest sister was old enough to be his mother, and his own mother was forty-six years old when he was born, and even more significant was the fact that his father was almost sixty years old when he was begotten. From birth he was sickly and delicate because his mother was no longer able to give him the care she gave the others and he, therefore, became the object of much care and coddling by the other children. The father was an invalid for a few years and died when the patient was three years old, so that this boy lacked the authoritative influence of the father image, without which no man can develop sexually in normal fashion. To be normal the boy must go through the Œdipus situation, that is, he must learn to overcome his feelings of hostility for the father, by giving up the idea that his mother belongs to him alone and that he must depend on her for all his outlets. In other words, he must give up his infantile needs for his mother and identify himself with his father. By identification we mean a sort of absorption of the father's attributes into himself so as to be like him or even better and stronger than his father. Through father identification the boy is enabled to become a virile man himself, but the absence of this identification always results in some sexual abnormality. Moreover, our little patient was subjected to many traumas as a result of having slept with his sisters since

he was a baby, and because he was forever surrounded by strong feminine influences.

I am pleased to say that our little boy developed well and is now a husky back of his school's football team, but I am sure that if it had not been for his uncle's efforts, who followed my suggestion and counteracted the abnormalities so plainly visible at this early age, the boy would have developed into an abnormal human being. It was a case of a strong feminine predisposition which was probably congenital, and a bad environment.

This case clearly showed that in order to solve even a single sex problem one must have a good knowledge of the whole biology of sex, and this is especially important in the case of neurotically predisposed adults. Thus I saw a patient recently who was an inordinate masturbator; a doctor told him that he must stop it at once because of the physical or mental harm that might befall him. The patient obeyed but soon developed very active attacks of anxiety. Only a few days ago, I saw a young woman who was told by an analyst not to have any conflicts about masturbation, so that for more than a year she has been masturbating three or four times daily. In the first case the doctor stopped an inadequate autoerotic outlet before the patient was able to give and take object love, directly or in sublimated form, so that the sudden cessation brought about an anxiety neurosis; while in the second case the patient was allowed to continue for years an autoerotic sexual activity, with prolific phantasies which more or less incapacitated her in the struggle for existence and in attaining the love object. For, as you know, it is the sublimation or the deflection of sexual tension to higher aims that impels us to normal activities.

All persons who linger in autoerotic outlets are adhering to a fragment of their infantile sexuality, and they can relinquish it only through an adjustment of their whole psychic

life. The student who indulged in phantasies of an anal-sadistic nature showed a definite fixation in his autoerotic period of life, the adjustment of which required many months. When his brother offered him coitus he was altogether unprepared for object outlet. He was still under the domination of the infantile sexuality and consequently he could find no satisfaction in coitus, he could not even accomplish it, a failure which produced many additional resistances in the form of somatopsychic ideas. To be sure the patient was of the schizoid type and suffered from a compulsion neurosis which manifested itself in a "reasoning mania" about the female sexual organs. His phantasies were more or less obsessive in character and for the most part referred to the structures and mechanisms of his sister's genitalia. This was readily traced to many sexual traumas at the age of three, four, and five years when he slept with his sisters.[4]

In brief there is no such thing as a manifest sexual problem which can be solved by giving positive or negative advice. A few years ago I saw a very masochistic patient. He continually fancied himself degraded and abused by tramps, fat elderly negro women, and brutal policemen. Investigation showed that the patient was unable to control his bladder and rectum until beyond the age of puberty, for which he was brutally punished by his parents. At a very early age the spanking evoked sensuous feelings in the genitals which led to uncontrollable masturbation which, in turn, brought additional punishment and torture. Here the aggressive or sadistic component instead of being repressed and sublimated was kept through the constant beating and torture, until it finally became endowed with so much *libido* that it took the place of the whole end aim of sex. In other

[4] It is not possible to give here even a brief analysis of this case. Those who are interested will find many similar cases in *Psychoanalysis, Its Theories and Application,* Brill.

words the patient suffered from a perversion, instead of utilizing his aggression in the struggle for existence, and, in mating, it became pathological and changed into masochism. Here, too, the bisexual predisposition was strongly feminine. Unfortunately, I must say that the doctors had indirectly helped to bring about this pathological state, for it was they who advised the spanking and tying of the patient's hands in order to stop his infantile masturbation. On the other hand I have also seen many cases in which physicians directly advised sex outlets to neurotics and psychotics, assuring these patients or their relatives that "marriage will cure everything." I have seen præcox men and women who were thus married off by their parents because the family physician hearing the patient's erotic hallucinations and delusions, which are invariably present in such cases, thought that they were in need of sex. As a typical example of its kind I can cite the following case: About two years ago I saw a cultured American young woman who was practically forced by her parents to marry an elderly widower way below her station, for this very reason. The patient suffered from schizoid maniac attacks. When I saw her she was very depressed, and among other depressive ideas she kept repeating, "Why should I get well to live with this man," and she committed suicide in the sanatorium. It is the same old story, laymen and usually also physicians have always sensed that sex plays a part in mental disturbances, probably because unhappy love affairs often precede the appearance of psychoses, and because schizophrenic patients usually talk about sex, and as the average physician knows little about psychiatry or psychosexuality, cause and effect were, and still are, mixed up. The only thing true is Professor Freud's statement: "No neurosis is possible in a normal vita sexualis," but the disturbance rarely means just a need for physical sex, in fact, I am inclined to say, never.

I do not wish to appear that I am blaming my colleagues. I am well aware that they had little education in mental medicine and less in psychological aspects of sex. They rely on the knowledge picked up here and there which surely is not scientific. To show the kind of cases that impel me to make these statements I will note the following history: C. was a bachelor of fifty years, a successful business man who lived quite happily with his very old mother and two older brothers. He never thought of marriage until the brothers decided that one of them ought to get married, so as to continue the family name, and as they were too old to do so they advised C. to get a wife. As C. never had any urge in this direction he sensibly decided to consult a physician. The latter gave him a thorough physical examination and saw no reason why he should not marry. Thereupon C. selected as his spouse a young woman of twenty-seven years. As he never had any experience in sex matters, never having had any sex need, he found himself absolutely impotent. He soon returned to his doctor who this time examined also his genito-urinary tract and was quite mystified to find everything normal. Nevertheless, he treated the patient for many months with prostatic massage, electricity, instillations as well as with tonics and glands, all, of course, to no avail, for the patient remained impotent. The patient was then referred to a number of specialists and finally was sent to me by the surgeon he consulted last. Inquiry showed that the patient never manifested any psychic manifestations of sex. As far as he could recall he never masturbated and never had any sexual desire for women. If not for his brothers' suggestions it never would have occurred to him to enter wedlock. Now he felt guilty toward his young wife and earnestly wished to be helped, but he frankly admitted that if not for his wife he would not seek any treatment. When I diagnosed this case as "Sexual Imbecility" I had in mind individuals in

whom there is a partial or complete lack of the sexual urge. Such patients apparently have no sexual sense, although they seem to be normal in every other way. In my entire practice I have seen only about six cases of this kind. By analogy one thinks of such a state as color blindness, which also seems to be congenital. I will confess that I cannot give any satisfactory explanation for "Sexual Imbecility," although I could give plenty of theoretical speculations. At all events, one wonders why C.'s family physician did not readily recognize the abnormal factors in the case and why he so glibly advised marriage. It should have occurred to him that there must be something wrong mentally or emotionally when a perfectly healthy man of fifty years finds it necessary to consult him to determine whether he should marry. Again I repeat that the psychosexually normal person does not come to doctors for advice. The family physician would have spared Mr. and Mrs. C. much trouble and mortification had he understood some of the psychic and emotional elements of the case.

No disturbance is so profound and effective as those in the psychosexual spheres. They are always fundamental and usually concern predisposed individuals subjected to a special environment. To cure the sexual difficulty the individual as a whole must be treated, for the sexual life is only a reflection of the person's whole make up. The average man who wants a woman usually gets her, legitimately or illegitimately, conflicts or no conflicts; he does not go to a doctor for advice. Those who consult doctors are always obsessed by neurotic conflicts which the patients alone cannot solve. What they want is the doctor to take the responsibility; they wish to be in a position to say: "Dr. So-and-So told me to do it." When I was associated with Dr. Frederick Peterson, we were once consulted by as frank a homosexual as I have ever seen, a man who for many years had had all sorts of perverse homo-

sexual experiences. When he talked to me about his case I told him if he was really serious in his wish to be cured it might be possible to adjust him to heterosexuality after prolonged treatment. He then asked whether that would mean that he would have to consort with "bad women." I laughingly replied that it would take some time before we would get to this problem and besides, I thought that "bad women" would be preferable to *fellatio* with men. As I was very much in doubt about curing the patient I made no effort to hold him. I realized that he was dominated by very deep resistances and that he really preferred homosexuality to heterosexuality. Soon after this consultation he wrote a letter to the erstwhile *New York Medical Journal,* saying that Dr. Peterson and I had advised him to go out with lewd women. To be sure he failed to mention what the real issue was. The rationalization indulged in by people to justify their sexual resistances is truly amazing. Their neurotic conflicts prevent them from a positive sexual adjustment, hence they are unable to live either a legitimate or illicit normal sexual life. Psychoanalytically, one would say, they are afraid of the father (castration fear) and as the doctor stands in the patient's mind in *loco patris* they blame him for everything. A. W., the homosexual just mentioned, later returned to me and was very apologetic and contrite. I found him to be suffering from a paranoid state in addition to his homosexuality.

Often I have been asked about my attitude toward nonneurotics, who ask questions about sexual behavior, as, for example, young people, or parents who notice sex struggles in their children and wish to learn how to advise them. Last, but not least, what happens, sexually speaking, to those patients who are discharged as adjusted. Before answering I will quote a witticism, which though probably uttered by a downright cynic, nevertheless contains a deep

thought. It runs as follows: "A wife is like an umbrella, at worst one may also take a taxi." [5] The witticism implies that an umbrella does not always afford enough protection from the rain. The words "at worst" can mean only: When it is raining very hard. A taxi is a public conveyance. As you see we deal with a figure of comparison which is puzzling and seemingly impossible and is not in itself very witty. It is wit by allusion and omission; taxi, public conveyance—public women. The omission makes it still more unintelligible. The comparison may be worked out in the following manner. A man marries in order to protect himself against the temptations of sensuality, but it then turns out that after all marriage affords no full gratification for one of stronger needs, just as one takes along an umbrella for protection against rain, only to get wet in spite of it. In both cases one must look for additional protection, in one case one must take a taxi, in the other, woman procurable for money. The wit is then almost entirely replaced by a cynicism. That marriage is not the organization which can always satisfy a man's sexuality is well known, although one does not dare say it frankly and loudly, unless one is forced to it by the love of truth and the zeal for reform. And if the ultimate protection of marriage does not solve the problem, what about the millions who are not married.[6] Only the most bigoted fanatics fail to see the struggles and by-ways that mankind has made for itself in its efforts to solve this weak spot of civilization. We who look at the individual as he is and not as he should be, see the enormous sexual struggles that our social economic problems force upon him. He is ready to mate at puberty, but he is compelled to wait at least ten to fifteen years longer. Nature has made no provision for such a state of affairs, consequently many individuals attain

[5] Freud, *Wit and Its Relation to the Unconscious.* Translated by Brill.
[6] See footnote 3.

their aim by illegitimate means. It is an enormous struggle with one's moral code, with one's super-ego, as we would say,[7] but sooner or later if one does not marry he succumbs to illicit sex. Contrary to general belief it is a very hard struggle. I have never seen a single normal man who just decided to consort with women and forthwith put it into operation. I investigated this very question in a few hundred men and found that most of them merge into a conflict ranging from months to years, before they finally resort to prostitution. I am referring here to people who have not necessarily consulted me professionally, to the so-called average person who, if he is influenced at all, is by his experienced friends or classmates. To return to the question. Those who consult me about their sex problems as such are always told the same thing, that I am a physician and not a teacher of either morality or immorality. To parents I say that the children should be fully instructed about sex; that every question should be truthfully and sensibly answered, no matter how early in life it is asked; but that they should at the same time impress the child with the importance of sexual control and sublimation. I frankly tell parents that they should not be alarmed when they find a child masturbating, because masturbation is a regular manifestation in our modern sex life, and that if their grown-up children will not marry early they will probably resort to illicit relations despite all admonitions to the contrary. Hence it is best to enlighten them about all the social, psychic and hygienic factors of sex. I naturally advise early marriage wherever possible, even though birth control must be resorted to.

As to my patients, they fall into two categories, the psychotics and neurotics. The former even when fairly well adjusted lead a very precarious sexual life. If they are mar-

[7] Brill, "The Application of Psychoanalysis to Psychiatry," *Journal of Nervous and Mental Diseases.*

ried I naturally advise no more children and as a rule most of those who belong to this class (schizophrenics) seem to have very little need for sex. I have in mind a number of schizophrenics who, as a result of treatment, have made good adjustment to life, who seem, however, to have no craving for sex. Maniac depressive cases which can be adjusted by analysis lead good sexual lives, the others cannot be controlled. It is quite different with the neurotics. When they are cured of their neuroses they invariably make good sexual adjustments, even better than the average person. Here I am impelled to say a few words of warning against those so-called "psychoanalysts," or rather pseudoanalysts, who preach sex freedom, free sexual expression, and similar slogans. Unfortunately, we cannot prohibit anyone from calling himself a psychoanalyst, but I wish to say that neither Professor Freud nor any of his pupils ever advocated any such pernicious nonsense. As long as civilization will endure sex will have to be controlled, and only irresponsible imbeciles can believe that one can run riot with sex. Because sex repression plays a part in the neuroses it does not imply that sex license spells perfect health. We maintain that sex was always controlled. In a state of nature it was inexorably restricted by the struggle for existence; in civilization society found it expedient, for very good reasons, to reëstablish those restraints that were abrogated through the lightening of the struggle for existence. Without restraint or control there could be no sublimation and hence no cultured state. Enough of that sex freedom asininity. On the other hand repression means ignoring the very existence of the sex instinct which is equally foolish. We must endeavor to get full cognition of the sex instinct in order to be in a position to control and adjust it to our state of civilization. I have the reputation of being an expert in assisting young people

into marriage. That is true only to the extent that I impress all my single patients with the benefits of matrimony despite its imperfections, and most of my patients marry soon after I discharge them.

I am also frequently consulted by married men and women who just wish to discuss the problem of "having an affair," and in some cases where the wife or husband is ill, whether they should indulge in illicit relations. I always tell them to continue in the straight and narrow path, realizing, however, that my advice will not always be heeded. The fact that they come to consult me shows that they are under the stress of a conflict. They do not belong to the crowd, they are more or less neurotic and need more than mere advice.

To sum up I would say that whenever a physician is confronted with a psychosexual problem there is usually also a social or ethical conflict, and a neurosis or psychosis behind it. Superficial advice, therefore, does not help and often hurts. Physical treatment has never cured psychosexual problems; it usually does some harm. Psychosexual impotence for example could be readily cured psychotherapeutically if it were not for the complications resulting from physical therapy, such as prostatic massage to which the patients have always been subjected long before coming to us.

A knowledge of the psychology of sex is indispensable. Every physician should know enough of the normal and abnormal factors of sex to be able to discuss them intelligently, for one must not forget that the most abnormal perversions often originate in the "cleanest and most wholesome" environments. Psychosexuality should therefore form a part of the curriculum of every medical school. As psychoanalysis has been one of the greatest factors in illuminating the various manifestations of normal and abnormal sex, every physician would be greatly benefited by studying the

works of Freud and his pupils. By presenting to us the complete picture of the psychosexual evolution from infancy to adolescence Professor Freud integrates sex with our psychic life and gives us a thorough comprehension not only of the normal impulse but also of the normal roots of the perversions and their negatives, or the neurosis.

STATEMENT ON CONTINENCE IN RELATION TO SOCIAL HYGIENE *

PREPARED BY THE SOCIAL HYGIENE COMMITTEE AND ADOPTED BY THE BRITISH SOCIAL HYGIENE COUNCIL AS THE BASIS OF THEIR POLICY AT THEIR MEETING ON MARCH 22ND, 1926

F. A. Powell Aveling, Ph.D., D.Sc., D.D.
University Reader in Psychology
King's College, London
F. C. Bartlett, M.A.,
Director of the Psychological Laboratory
University of Cambridge
William Brown, M.A., M.D.,
Wilde Reader in Mental Philosophy
University of Oxford
J. A. Hadfield, M.A., M.D.,
Lecturer on Psychology
King's College, London
Maurice W. Keatinge, M.A., D.Sc.,
Reader in Education in the
University of Oxford
J. Lewis McIntyre
Anderson Lecturer in Comparative Psychology
University of Aberdeen
H. Crichton Miller, M.A., M.D.,
Hon. Director, Tavistock Clinic
for Functional Nerve Cases
A. W. P. Wolters, M.A.,
Lecturer in Education
University College, Reading

* Published in *Foundations of Social Hygiene,* by the British Social Hygiene Council, Inc., Carteret House, Westminster, S. W. 1, and reprinted with their kind permission.

General Statement

The British Social Hygiene Council are of opinion that:

(1) In the interests of the race and of the individual it is essential that the stability of the family in marriage should be preserved, and social habits and customs should be adjusted to this end.

(2) There is overwhelming evidence that irregular sex relations, whether in married or unmarried, lead to physical, mental or social harm.

(3) There is no evidence either from physiology or from experience that for the unmarried sexual intercourse is a necessity for the maintenance of physical health.

(4) There is no evidence either from psychology or from experience that for the unmarried sexual intercourse is a necessity for the maintenance of mental health.

Memorandum

1. For some time it has been realized that the advances in physiology and psychology, as bearing on sex life in mankind, render it desirable to restate the teaching of science in regard to the reaction of sexual continence on personal well-being.

2. In presenting the statement and the evidence prepared by expert members of the Social Hygiene Committee it has been thought desirable to make the following remarks on the subject from the standpoint of organized social life.

3. The problems of sex are inseparably bound up with those of social life. From earliest times sex relations have been guided and controlled by custom, and in all communities as civilization has advanced, some of these customs have been embodied in legally imposed limitations. By the majority in each community these restrictions have been accepted as necessary, and have in the course of time been extended to the prohibition and punishment of such crimes as incest, homosexuality, bigamy, any sexual relations below certain ages, procurations, and so on.

4. The realizable ideal of monogamous family life has been generally accepted in this country, and is maintained not only by custom, but also increasingly by legal enactment.

We regard stable family life as essential to the welfare of

the race, and consider that all extramarital relations in their very nature are a direct attack on marriage and the family, and should be regarded as such by the community. This does not preclude the consideration of reforms of the marriage laws in this country, as, for instance, those recommended by the Royal Commission on Divorce. That this ideal of celibacy and monogamy is practicable is evidenced by the fact that in this country it is the actual life of a large part of the community. Nor is it unreasonable to require the practice of this ideal, in view of the momentous consequences to the social fabric of departure from it. That the limitations of sex relationships involved in this ideal can now also be commended on the basis of biological teaching is indicated in the appended memoranda.

5. A grave consequence of irregular sex relationship has been the devastating prevalence of venereal diseases. These would completely disappear in a couple of generations, given universal compliance with the ideal standard of conduct. At present these diseases are among the chief causes of death, are responsible for a high proportion of the total occupants of lunatic asylums, and for vast suffering in the innocent as well as in those who incur the direct consequences of their own conduct.

6. We anticipate the time when the moral pressure of public opinion, reinforced by the conscience of the individual, will insist on the presumption that when there is marital infidelity, or when marriage takes place in the absence of previous chastity, the moral culpability is as great in a man as in a woman. The integrity of family life requires this equally high standard; and it will, we are confident, be increasingly demanded.

7. We recognize that the present disparity in number of men and women raises in this generation exceptional difficulties, but these difficulties do not justify any social recognition of modification of the basic standard.

8. The widespread knowledge of contraceptives has partially removed from both sexes an important restraining influence on the side of continence, and it is this fact, as well as our advance in biological knowledge, which has appeared to render the publication of this considered statement desirable. We do not regard the fear of pregnancy or disease as an adequate motive for continence, and we do not regret that extramarital chastity must in future depend more and more upon basic ideals of life, rather than upon fear of consequences.

9. We are fully aware that the standard of conduct embodied in the preceding paragraphs necessitates abstention from sexual intercourse during part of each individual's adult life; and this gives added importance to the fact that this basis of conduct in its application to personal life receives support from modern physiology and psychology.

10. Experience over long ages has shown that extramarital sexual indulgence promotes irresponsibility and is not infrequently followed by sexual excesses and perversions. In such cases there ensues individual demoralization, with decadence of the community when these practices are widespread.

11. In promoting the advance of social morality and hygiene importance must always attach to the following among other considerations.

12. It is necessary that all young persons should be taught the elements of biology, including physiology and hygiene, thus cultivating that individual self-respect which comes from such knowledge.

13. We regard it as fundamentally important that both parents and teachers should also know the elements of biology, including psychology, as bearing on character; and that thus character training should become as important a part of home life and school work as the training of intelligence. In this connection we would emphasize the value of more adequate facilities for both physical and mental recreation, and for all measures aiding in the control and sublimation of passion in adolescence and early adult life, among which adequate recreation, exercise and work, moderation in food and abstinence from stimulants play an important part.

14. For the majority of young persons who are guided less by reason than by ideals and practical aims, we urge the cultivation of competitive athletics, as giving the strongest motive for physical fitness and the surest diversion from the sexual instinct.

15. We urge the necessity of studying the problems of housing, of immigration, of incidence of taxation, of restrictions imposed on marriage in certain employments, and of accepted standards of comfort, with a special view to the adoption of measures facilitating earlier marriage and making family life more universally attainable.

16. There is needed, furthermore, an increasing realization that society stands for the claims of posterity, and that each man

and woman may have the moral responsibility for passing on undimmed the lamp of life.

17. We urge the importance of the cultivation of public opinion in favor of an elevated view of the sexual functions and of the idealization of love, and of appeals to self-respect and to the sense of right to this end. From the personal standpoint, illicit relations, particularly if they are furtive and irresponsible, prevent sex from taking its due place as the physical basis of ideal love. It is to be hoped that in future all illicit relations, whether before or after marriage, will be recognized as contrary to man's higher nature.

18. We recognize, finally, that individual hardship must continue to arise for those who desire marriage, but for whom it may remain impracticable. The welfare of organized society, and in the end of each individual, impels us to advocate this basis standard. The community has reason to appreciate and value highly the sacrifices of those who in such circumstances adhere to this standard.

Summary of Evidence Prepared by Physiologists and Psychologists for the Social Hygiene Committee

Sexual Continence from the Standpoint of Physiology

Modern physiological development has emphasized in the individual the dual function of the essential reproductive glands, *i.e.* the testis and the ovary. In each case two distinctive secretions are formed:

(1) The external secretion, containing the spermatozoön or ovum.

(2) The internal secretion, which, like the internal secretions from other organs and glands of the body, passes either directly or indirectly into the general blood-circulatory system, and has, as yet, little understood effects upon the workings of other organs and tissues. These internal secretions are responsible for the secondary sexual characteristics which normally develop at puberty.

The sex appetite has in the past been too loosely classified with the other appetites—hunger, thirst, etc. It is important to emphasize the basic difference. The function of reproduction,

while essential for the maintenance of the race, is not essential to the maintenance of the existence or the reactions of the individual organism, whereas the satisfaction of the other appetites is. Apart from this function, the physiological importance of the reproductive glands lies in their coöperation in the communal life of the various parts of the body, this being effected by the internal secretions. The external secretion can be suppressed without interfering with this coöperation. There is no definite physiological evidence to prove that the control of the sexual function in either sex, *i.e.* partial or complete continence, results in any harmful effect upon the normal physiological activities of the organism.

There is no physiological basis for the oft-repeated (but irresponsible) assertion that sexual intercourse is essential for the maintenance of the healthy metabolisms of the normal organism. Nocturnal emissions are physiologically normal, and there is no scientific evidence to show that these produce any harmful effects upon the general metabolism of the individual experiencing them.[1]

Sexual Continence from the Standpoint of Psychology

It is a common fallacy that sexual continence tends to produce disordered mental conditions, a belief which may have arisen in part from the supposed greater frequency of neuroses amongst unmarried people, and in part because psycho-analysts (*i.e.* the strict followers of Freud) have taught that psychoneuroses are always due to sexual "repression." Although there is an element of truth in both these statements, they are often misinterpreted and misunderstood.

It is therefore desirable to restate the matter.

1. *Marriage as the ideal.* We regard marriage, which gives an opportunity for the full expression of the sexual instincts in love for the partner, and of the parental instincts in devotion and care for the children, as psychologically the healthiest life for the average individual, man or woman.

[1] Consensus of opinion of the following: Winifred Cullis, O.B.E., D.Sc., Professor of Physiology, Univ. of London; Israel Feldman, M.R.C.S., Late Senior Lecturer, Physiology, London Hospital; Julian S. Huxley, M.A., Professor of Zoölogy, King's College, London; J. Arthur Thomson, M.A., LL.D., Regius Professor of Natural History, Aberdeen University.

2. *Sexual Restraint.* There is, however, no evidence to lead us to believe that ordinary restraint of natural sexual impulses produces any psychological abnormality. Indeed there are many men and women whose daily experience proves that it is perfectly possible for even highly sexed individuals to remain continent before marriage, without any abnormal psychological effects.

The belief that sexual continence in itself leads to nervous disorders is refuted by the experience of married people whose work or occupation keeps them for long periods away from their partner's society, *e.g.* Arctic explorers and whalers, not to mention convicts. There is no evidence that continence, lasting sometimes for years, produces any neurotic symptoms in these men—indeed such men, while continent, are extraordinarily fit.

It is true that if the sexual instinct is strongly and persistently aroused without finding satisfaction a condition of "morbid anxiety" sometimes occurs—as when a married couple with normal sex feelings sleep together, but for prudential or other reasons deny themselves sex relations. Under these conditions continence for many persons may be psychologically ill-advised. The abnormality in such a case results from the fact that the instinctive impulse is excessively stimulated without finding adequate outlet and expression. This state of morbid anxiety may obviously be prevented, as, for instance, by (a) removing the embargo—giving full expression to love in normal sex relations; (b) removing the stimulus, *e.g.* by the husband and wife occupying separate rooms; or (c) by adopting other means which will from the psychological point of view obviate the strain. In one or another of these ways the balance between the stimulus and expression may be restored.

In the case of the unmarried these conditions do not prevail, for normally there is not the same intimacy of relation, and therefore not the same strong and continuous arousal of the sex instinct. It is therefore quite consistent to demand complete continence before marriage, whilst ordinarily denying its advisability in married life.

A distressed state of mind similar to that of the "anxiety" state amongst the married may, however, arise amongst the unmarried if they continually subject themselves or are subjected to over stimulation of their sex instincts, whether

from plays, books, or amusements, or if they are without opportunity for sublimation of their normal sex instincts. If young men and women persistently indulge their sex phantasies they must expect to be the victims of acute moral and psychological distress. The arousal of these passions without satisfaction produces psychic tension, and the strain of keeping in check highly stimulated and pent-up feelings is similar to the strain of battle in which fear is continually aroused without finding an outlet. In both instances emotional excitement and morbid anxiety are liable to result.

But this result may be minimized by the avoidance of excessive stimulation of sexual desire, or by the provision of healthful opportunities for the maintenance of balance between stimulus and expression; the sexual instinct then assuming normal proportions.

The real harm, whether amongst the married or unmarried, comes, not from the restraint of normal sex desires, but from the frustration of a natural instinctive impulse artificially stimulated beyond the means of healthy control.

3. *Sexual Repression and Psycho-neuroses.* That "sexual repression" may sometimes cause psycho-neuroses (hysteria, obsessions, etc.) few psycho-therapists would deny. But it is not generally understood that the psycho-analyst used "repression" in a purely technical sense, and that what he calls "repression" is not what the layman means in his use of that term, as synonymous with restraint. The psycho-analyst does not mean that psycho-neurosis occurs because an adult restrains his fully-formed sex passions. What he says is that because of abnormal conditions in early childhood the sexual instincts have never fully developed into their adult form; that is to say, these instincts have not undergone normal development in early childhood, and therefore remain as "unconscious wishes" which persist and emerge later in one form or another of neurotic disorder.

What the psycho-analyst means when he says that psycho-neuroses are due to "sexual repression" is something very different from saying that they are due to sexual restraint. No responsible psycho-analyst would maintain that the suppression of his sexual impulses could produce a psycho-neurosis in an otherwise healthy person. The basis of the neurosis has been laid down in early childhood, as indicated above, and even the "repression" itself is a completely unconscious process—not

a conscious process like that of the suppression of impulses such as anger, fear, or sex, of which we are completely aware, and which we necessarily restrain every day of our lives. The appeal which some make to the "New Psychology" in defense of incontinence is therefore without foundation, and is based on ignorance or misconception of what psychology really teaches.

There are some, it is true, more outside than inside the ranks of psycho-therapists, who advocate sexual relations as the most direct method of liberating these repressed instincts; but this view, far from being necessary to psycho-therapy, is discouraged not only by Freud, but also by the most prominent psycho-therapists of other schools of thought.

4. *Celibacy and Nervous Disorders.* It may be true that unmarried people are more prone to nervous breakdown than married—whether this is actually the case we are not in a position to say. If it be so, it is certainly not due solely, as we have already explained, to the mere restraint of *normal* sex desires. Rather we should say that because the woman with strong normal sex instincts is more likely to get married than the one with "sexual repression," this leaves among the unmarried more of those with "sexual repression," and therefore prone to nervous disorders. It would not therefore be surprising if we were to find more psycho-neuroses amongst the unmarried. There are, on the other hand, numbers of healthy unmarried women who have normal sex desires, but who have satisfactorily sublimated these and adopted a healthy attitude of mind toward life.

This argument applies even more to men than to women. It is much truer to say in general that the man who remains celibate is unmarried because he is neurotic than that he is neurotic because he is unmarried, or has otherwise denied himself sex satisfaction.

5. *Temperamental Differences in Sex.* There seems to be no doubt that people differ very considerably physically, in the strength and vigor of their sexual instincts, this depending on physiological factors such as the activity of the endocrine glands, which play an important part in the psychological make-up of the individual. Some are less strongly endowed with sex feelings, whereas in others these feelings are very potent. There is little difficulty for persons of the first type, whether married or unmarried, to restrain themselves, whereas

others may feel that some sexual expression is an imperative necessity; and to them continence entails considerable hardship. It is unjust that we should judge the latter without understanding their difference in temperament. The main problem of continence refers especially to these highly sexed individuals, but for everybody it is a real problem, requiring instruction, guidance, and self-control.

For those with vigorous physical sexuality the hardship can be diminished, without resorting to promiscuity or any other form of incontinence, in two ways. First, by regarding the condition as temporary, for difficulties are much easier to bear when we realize that they will soon terminate. If men or women look forward to getting married, it will be much easier to remain chaste; they will restrain themselves in this as they do in their other passions and desires. Secondly, by the pursuit of activities, ideals, and ambitions which will serve both as an outlet for personal energies and incidentally promote the earlier possibility of marriage.

We have confined ourselves in this statement to the psychological point of view, and have not dealt with the moral and social aspects, which nevertheless we regard as no less important.

EXTRACTS FROM IDEALS OF LOVE AND MARRIAGE *

THE COMMITTEE ON MARRIAGE AND HOME FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA

Bishop James Cannon, Jr., *Chairman*
Very Rev. Howard C. Robbins, D.D., *Vice Chairman*
Rev. Worth M. Tippy, D.D., *Secretary*
Rev. John W. Elliott
Mrs. Jeannette W. Emrich
Mrs. John Ferguson
Rev. Charles K. Gilbert, D.D.
Rev. J. Henry Harms, D.D.
Rev. Hubert C. Herring, D.D.
Rev. John W. Langdale, D.D.
Bishop Francis J. McConnell
Rev. John A. Marquis, D.D.
Mrs. W. A. Newell
Mrs. I. H. O'Harra
Mrs. John D. Rockefeller, Jr.
Mrs. Robert E. Speer
Mrs. Anna Garlin Spencer
Rev. Henry W. Sweets, D.D.
Rev. Alva W. Taylor, D.D.
Mr. George Wickersham
Rev. B. S. Winchester, D.D.
Mrs. W. C. Winsborough

In accounting for the profound disturbance of the home, society should not be deceived into thinking that it is something which has suddenly appeared for the first time in the

* Reprinted in this volume with the kind consent of the Commission.

life of humanity. The disturbance is universal and reaches far back into the past. Some of its deeper causes lie in the differences in the natures of men and women. They are biological, psychological, historical, and economic, and therefore of profound significance and importance. They will always make the maintenance of a successful home a high accomplishment, demanding the best that is in men and women.

Function of the Ideal

In this first report the committee seek to express the ideals of love and marriage which have emerged out of the experience of the race and the forms which they have taken in this country.

The ideal is highly functional in all human endeavor. It is what is seen to be the good, the true, and the beautiful. It is the goal of effort, the pattern for that which is being constructed. It is the nature of an ideal never to be completely attained, yet always to be in process of attainment. The ideal itself can never be compromised without personal and social degradation, no matter how often men fail or how far the experience of daily life falls short of its realization. A man must hold to his vision of perfection though he never fully reaches it.

The custody of the ideal and of the spiritual forces which act redemptively in the soul of man is a supreme though not exclusive responsibility of organized religion, and this is true with regard to ideals of love and marriage. Whatever the church may do to adjust its practical ministries to the actualities of human weakness and need, or whatever measures the State may take to safeguard public welfare, the church's teaching ideal must be kept as pure and high as the doctrine of Christ and the noblest dream of youth. That this ideal is practical in a work-a-day world is shown by the lives of countless numbers of husbands and wives in every generation, whose minds have been wholesome and who have lived beautifully together.

The study at this initial stage of the inquiry has been centered upon ideals, and largely separated from the vexed problems of divorce and matters of civil and ecclesiastical law and administration, leaving those to later consideration. This is done because the teaching ideal is more significant than the concrete measures instituted for the safeguarding of marriage. The value

of the church in this sphere lies not so much in its discipline, important as that is, as in its positive affirmations of aims and the effectiveness with which they are taught.

The Monogamous Family

That monogamy is the basic form of human marriage is recognized by most anthropologists. As Professor H. S. Jennings said before the Conference on Family Life in America Today in Buffalo in October, 1927, "The monogamous family, with life-long union of the mates, appears as the final term in a long evolutionary series." Polygamy has disappeared from Western civilization. Illicit extramarital relationships do not invalidate the principle of monogamy but only make trouble in particular homes. In countries where concubinage has a legal status, especially as relates to the rights and legitimacy of children, as in China and Japan, it is not strictly a form of polygamy, although hardly distinguishable from it. The emancipation of women and the progress of Christian ideals are undermining the custom. In Japan concubinage of the Chinese type was abolished in 1880, and the last two Emperors have set the example of strict monogamy to their people.

The marriage of more than one woman to one man when both are living is clearly out of harmony with a highly developed culture where women have attained freedom, because it cannot but be intolerable to them to be treated as subordinate beings ministering to desire or as maternal animals. The free woman, on a plane of equality and self-respect, can be the life mate of one man only. And doubtless as civilization becomes more unified throughout the world all forms of polygamy will finally disappear.

The American Ideal of Marriage

The New World, while inheriting the traditions and institutions of the Old, has yet been singularly free to develop a life of its own, comparatively unshackled from the past. Countless young people in this land have seen in marriage not only a monogamous relationship but an inspiring vision of devoted loyalty and life-long companionship between one man and one woman. Most of our young people love like that at one time or another, and all of them desire to do so. They have entered into a relationship in marriage which to them has been deeply

and consciously rooted in sex experiences and which they have thought of as natural but at the same time as spiritual; a relationship which, in the words of Bishop A. C. Hall, "is to be not only life-long but life-wide in its extensions." These experiences were expected to culminate, and normally culminated, in the joys and responsibilities of parenthood. Ideally there could be no extramarital sex relationships, either before or after marriage, and the union was expected by both husband and wife and by society to endure until death. Difficulties and hardships were expected as a matter of course, but they were accepted as a part of the undertaking and were to be met and overcome or endured.

The Christian Concept

Now this is also the Christian concept of marriage as stated by our Lord Himself in words of extraordinary depths and power. A man, He said in the Sermon on the Mount, is not to think adultery in his heart. He is to discipline himself as he would pluck out an offending eye. A man and woman in marriage become one flesh—"They twain shall be one flesh"—that is to say, the union is organic; and it is God who unites them, which means that it is a profound biological-spiritual experience which comes out of the depths of life. The union is for life: "What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." The cruel Mosaic law which permitted a man to divorce his wife with no recourse for her is abrogated: "Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives; but from the beginning it was not so." He speaks in strikingly beautiful and sensitive words of how, "He which made them at the beginning made them male and female," and that, "For this cause shall a man leave father and mother and shall cleave to his wife."

It has been noted that love between the sexes and the love which expresses itself in religion are closely related. This does not mean that the emotional desires accompanying sex and that splendid love for God and mankind which is the glory of religion have the same source; but rather that the devoted and enduring love of one man and one woman for each other is like the love of God; and that the realization of such a love is akin to religious experience.

This concept of marriage prevails in the United States. It is

sound and should be preserved at whatever cost, especially since other and lower ideals are contending for supremacy. Young people are not deceived when they experience these profound emotions and these visions of mutual devotion. These are not meant to pass, although they often do, but to persist and to glorify life. They are consistent with the rough course of human life and with the personal differences and imperfections which cause all human relationships to fall so far short of perfection.

Spiritual relationship between the sexes is part of a larger moral order. It is linked with belief in God, with purposefulness in the universe, with sacrifice, with the struggle for human life, with the higher idealism and faith of mankind. These finally persist or perish together in the heart. The growth of a cynical attitude toward love, such as that which now appears in much current literature, strikes at our civilization. As has been said by André Maurois, "There is no doubt at all that it [romantic love] has been the inspiration for our noblest works of art and for the most resonant actions in our history. Practically the entire fabric of our Western civilization is born of a social system founded on respect for women and a belief in the inherent worth of love."

Tension in Marriage

But while all this is true, the intense emotions of the early period of marriage must be transmuted into something hardier and more spiritual. Young married people must soon face differences of personality, training and outlook, and the trying realities of life, the tension of which increases with years. They are first absorbed in one another; but they must soon also be absorbed in their children and in the work of the world. The sex instinct, which plays a great although indistinguishable part in early love, gradually takes its rightful and coördinated place in two lives sharing well distributed interests. True marriage, as Keyserling has pointed out, is a state of fine spiritual tension between two intelligent beings who must maintain themselves in a relationship which makes great demands upon character. Nothing can be taken for granted. The one who sees most must give most, and possibly suffer most. Great practical tasks, increasing in difficulty with age and waning strength, have to be faced and conquered, or the marriage is to that extent a failure.

Reference has been made to Count Keyserling's doctrine of marriage, in which he says that "all marriages which have served as symbols or models were examples of austere destiny joyously met." While this severe concept of marriage is associated mainly with the marriage of convention or with situations which often arise between intense and artistic persons, yet it is impossible to be blind to the amount of unhappiness which exists in many homes, even though alongside of beautiful daily experiences.[1] This raises the question whether happiness should ever be made the primary object of any human relationship, especially in such a fundamental social institution as the home. And a second question: Does not happiness tend to elude pursuit, and does it not come the more often when unsought along the pathway of loyalty and duty? Surely young people should not only be encouraged to continue as lovers, as they may, but also should be instructed more carefully in the higher reaches and social demands of marriage, and the transmutations that must take place if it is to succeed. A resolute will to succeed no matter what comes, a refusal to yield to difficulties that are inevitable, are of great importance to strong home ties.

Religion in the Home

Reference has been made to the spiritual character of true marriage, and to the conviction that it is God who joins the man and the woman together. But to recognize marriage at its beginning as sacramental is not enough. Religion at its best burns like an altar fire in the home, and God is the unseen guest day and night. Such an experience may seem difficult of realization, and it is, but not so difficult as appears. It requires

[1] The following statement by Rabindranath Tagore expresses the graver aspects of marriage: "If we accept the institution of marriage, we must also admit that no system can be devised to insure that its original object shall remain true throughout the long period covered by the life of the wedded couple. That is why both law and public opinion have to keep such vigilant watch from the outside. But when external compulsion tries to bind together those whom only mutual love can truly unite, it makes their relations inherently impure—in fact, no greater insult can be offered to man. Yet, all over the civilized world, man submits even to this for the sake of the welfare of his children. So far, no society has been able to claim that it has arrived at a faultless solution of the difficulty. In entering the married state we all have to make our plunge into the doubtful and leave it to Providence whether we shall sink, or swim through."—*The Book of Marriage*, p. 112.

daily consecration, daily thoughtfulness and daily "practice of the Presence of God." It is helped by the habit of church-going and by family prayers and grace before meat. The home as the basic social institution has its normal setting in the social life of the community, and consequently in the church, which is the organized expression of the community's spiritual aspirations. The home is doubly secure when the husband and wife keep their ideals by God's strength; when children learn to pray at their mother's knee, but also hear their fathers say with them their evening prayers; when the family go to church together as a family custom and as a conscious participation in community life. The child needs the divinest home earth can offer. He thrives best in settled ways, where his environing influences are familiar and life is on a high plane. He lives by love as much as by food and drink.

The Conflict with Desire

While we must start with the assumption that sex is indeed a creative force, it is destructive as well. The savage conflicts among the males of wild animals are evidences of a terrible as well as beneficent power. But they are inconsiderable as compared with the ravages of the same instinct in the human race. Marriage faces the primeval beast of lust and the delusive fascination of sex experience outside of marriage. Lust is not only responsible for prostitution and the White Slave traffic but for vices which sink men lower than beasts, and for the most brutal of crimes. Thousands of women face the beast at the beginning of married life. The cause of many a broken home lies here, hidden behind respectable appearances. It should also in fairness be said that the cause of many another broken home lies in the ignorance and defective training of many women for marriage.

But the delusive fascination of sex experience outside of marriage is more dangerous to the home than lust. Lust is repulsive. It shows as a beast. Desire is so compelling, so like true love to the inexperienced, so related to the glamour and poetry of life, that its poison is the more deadly. Desire, if no more than desire, makes of man the philanderer. Desire passes with satiety. Love includes but transforms desire. Love shines more brightly and in varying lights as desire passes into its spiritual fulfillments. The Christian ideal of marriage can therefore make

no compromise with lax sex relations. No matter how great its compassion for youth, or how swift its redemptive action, the Church must speak as did Christ to the woman whom He refused to condemn to a shocking death, but to whom He said, "Go and sin no more."

Companionate Marriage

The Christian concept of marriage now faces the plan of companionate marriage. Companionate marriage, when first proposed, was an ordinary marriage except that the husband and wife were not to have children. It is now put forward as a remedy for the great evil of pre-marital sex experiences by the young; and also as a relief from the strain of the sex instinct and the inability of youth, for economic reasons or because they are students, to enter into early marriages. The proposal includes the idea of trial marriage. It is related in the minds of its proponents to the new economic independence of women, large numbers of whom desire a form of marriage which gives them greater freedom. It still emphasizes the companionate idea to meet the desire of persons of both sexes who want to marry but wish or feel compelled to pursue their individual careers unhampered by children.

Companionate marriage involves legal marriage, knowledge of birth control, legal divorce by mutual consent at any time unless children are born, and without alimony unless in the judgment of the court there are circumstances which justify alimony. The young people may live in separate establishments, or they may live together as married people usually do. It is supposed that each of them will be a worker outside the home, except in case of students. It is hoped by its advocates that companionate marriage will be entered into romantically with the desire for life-long companionship, even with religious sanctions, and with the purpose of having children when husband, or the two working together, are able to give both mother and children proper care; and that companionate marriage will in most cases pass into permanent marriage. But, in any event, there will be a period of experience or trial during which young people may discover whether they can live together happily and whether it is desirable that they should have children.

If this is a fair statement of the aims and hopes of those who

advocate companionate marriage, its uncertainties and very great hazards should be pointed out with equal objectivity.

The chief danger of companionate marriage is that it puts sex desire first. It is a cause of regret that the author of *Companionate Marriage* treats sex indulgence by the young as a matter of little consequence. Sex desire, although one of the normal instincts of the body and one of the most powerful, should never be put first. To do so is to degrade not only the mind but sex itself. Sex experience is elevating and wholesome to body and mind only when it is under moral control and when it is transmuted into a spiritual experience by love and devotion.

Companionate marriage gives a wrong start to marriage by the ideal which it holds before the young. Instead of the lifelong companionship which purposes to overcome all difficulties and welcomes children, it starts with undue emphasis on self-regarding motives and raises the doubt as to the future. This is phychologically unfortunate and puts marriage on a distinctly low level.

The questions of divorce by mutual consent and birth control, which are essential aspects of companionate marriage, will be given attention in a later report; but before a satisfactory statement can be made, extended research must be undertaken. Such studies are now contemplated or are under way in various places, and their findings will become available. Civil divorce and remarriage are now provided by all nations, even by Catholic States. All churches either recognize divorce and remarriage on one or more grounds, or, as in the Roman Catholic Church, grant annulments of marriage. But such annulments just as effectually break up homes and unfortunately add a stigma of shame to the marriage which is annulled.

The State, of necessity, exercises wider latitude as to permissible grounds of divorce than the Church, as teacher of ideals, can allow itself to recognize either in its teachings or in the safeguards which it throws about marriage. But the State itself without more experience could not safely go far in such drastic legislative changes as are proposed by the advocates of companionate marriage. The expediency of Federal legislation for uniform marriage and divorce laws is debatable in the present state of knowledge on the subject. We know too little how limited the grounds of divorce should be, what freedom is

advisable to safeguard individual welfare, what safeguards are necessary, and what might be the moral effects of given legislation, as we shall know after a while from the varied experiences of the several States.

But this much can be said about divorce by mutual consent, as proposed in companionate marriage. Easy divorce is of greater concern to women than to men. Possibly women love more deeply and permanently than men. Women are tied to children as men can never be, and most women are badly handicapped for vocations other than home-making after years of work in the home. They are also handicapped by the failure of society to recognize the high art and science of home-making, which includes motherhood, an accomplishment not yet dignified as a profession, although the oldest in the world. Under divorce by mutual consent women almost inevitably find themselves quickly at a disadvantage. This is shown by the experience of Russia. Representatives of the peasant women came to the National Soviet Congress in 1927 and protested against a law that reduced a marriage of many years' duration and much shared labor to the status of a day's infatuation. Twice already the marriage laws of the Soviet Government have been modified and made more stringent to protect wives and children.[2]

The question also arises whether there is likelihood that companionate marriage would really accomplish the object which it seeks, especially with the young, and whether it would seri-

[2] What amounts to companionate marriage was established in Russia by the U. S. S. R. by a decree of Dec. 18, 1917, ([a]). The Code of Laws on Marriage, the Family and Guardianship, ([b]) operative from January, 1927, which extended and revised the original decree, established a minimum age of 16 and provides other restrictions upon marriage. Proper registration of marriage is made an incontestable proof of marriage. Religious rites have no legal effect. *De facto* marital relations may be legalized at any time by registration. All children are made legitimate. Marriage may be dissolved at any time during the lifetime of the parties by mutual consent of the parties, or by unilateral desire of either of them. The duty of maintaining children rests on both parties, and the rights of parents to maintenance by their children are safeguarded by statute.

([a]) *Decrees and Constitution of Soviet Russia.* (Reprint from *The Nation*), pp. 56-60.

([b]) *Soviet Union Year Book,* George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., pp. 397-404.

ously diminish illicit relationships. To enter companionate marriage is a comparatively serious matter, for which young people in their 'teens are seldom prepared and from which probably most young people would turn away. Those who desire indulgence are not likely to put themselves even under the restraints of companionate marriage. Very early marriages such as advocated in companionate marriage are likely to be impulsive and unconsidered, whereas what youth needs is greater maturity and longer acquaintance before marriage, better training for its responsibilities and a stronger voluntary discipline over the impulses of sex.

For these reasons the committee finds themselves strongly opposed to the proposal of companionate marriage. They believe that its effects would be anti-social. The sex instinct is not to be set free but to be held under control. Marriage should set out to be permanent. Companionate is a noble word, but all that it connotes of comradeship exists between all men and women who are well mated. The word is so rich in meaning that it should not be degraded by being fastened to any form of trial marriage, but increasingly associated with permanent and successful marriage.

The hardships and also the dangers of deferring marriage unduly must, however, be recognized. Deferred marriages have come to be a serious evil. But it is possible to live happily in small quarters under simple conditions and, if necessary, both husband and wife might work for a while. There is danger, however, in deferring children too long and of settling down to a life of indulgent freedom. Children have the best chance when parents are in their full vigor, not only at the time when their children are born but during the long years of dependence. Parents who obstruct the marriage of their children in order to continue to have their economic assistance—and there are many such—should remember this fact.

To those who think first of happiness it should be said that children bring the most exquisite happiness. Although a man comes of age at twenty-one he really becomes a citizen when he is married. But when his first child is born he enters into relationships with a social order which is universal and eternal. And if "the happiest person is the person who thinks the most interesting thoughts" and has the richest life experiences, surely fathers and mothers are thus rewarded.

Specific Recommendations

It is manifest that the church should lift up the Christian ideal of marriage with all the power of its great influence and that it should throw about it every possible religious sanction. Especially should the church emphasize the sterner obligations of marriage, the difficulties which may be expected, and develop the will to meet them. The ideal of a marriage for life is the only union which the church can teach. Divorce, even when allowed by the church, must be looked upon as a tragic and humiliating failure. Marriage which has children in mind, the right of children to happy homes, the joys of parenthood and the great meaning of marriage for the enrichment of life, must have a new place in preaching and in the entire program of the church.

There is a disquieting tendency amongst the well-to-do to shift the care of children to employed persons and to special schools. Parents should be urged by pastors to give the utmost personal attention to their children and to share sympathetically in their daily lives. Maids and governesses can never wholly take a mother's place, capable as their service may be. It is better when children find the mother at home to welcome them when they return from school. The poignant aspect of such counsel is not its reference to homes which can afford servants but that there are so many working mothers, often deserted or widowed mothers, who are still obliged, in spite of mothers' pensions, to be absent at work when the children come home from school.

The recent period of unemployment has witnessed mothers leaving their families to go to other communities in search of work, and this is not the first experience of the kind. When the late Arthur Nash of Cincinnati discovered the anxiety of the mothers in his factory at school-closing time, he shortened their day by an hour without reduction of pay that they might hurry home to meet their children. Employers, especially in highly competitive industries such as textiles, should be warned against wages so low as to require the additional wage of the mother in the factory to maintain the home, and against encouraging mothers to leave their children during the day. No mother should have to work from home at night. A living wage, which makes it possible for a workingman to maintain a family

of five in decency on his own wages, is a goal to be striven for by industry and society.

It should also be said that the home needs the presence and coöperation of the father as well as the mother. Sufficient attention has not been given to the part that the chronic neglect by the men of their function as fathers has played in creating present conditions. The rearing of children is extremely exacting and confining, and the mother should have the ungrudging and intelligent assistance of her husband. The children need the contribution which he has to make to their training, and the happiness of his companionship. These things should be taught by the church with plainness and reiteration.

Churches can do very much more than they are now doing to lessen the unhappiness and to arrest the collapse of breaking homes. Nobody knows the amount of unhappiness that exists in homes which are outwardly harmonious. It is certainly very great. The chief problems of marriage are subject to spiritual treatment. Every church, at its best, should be a kind of clinic to which people would come for guidance and for help to overcome their troubles, as they now go to physicians for their physical ills. Sympathy, faith, prayer, friendship, the help of God: these would restore many a home which would otherwise go on the rocks, or would bring happiness where there is now discontent and humiliation. Such assistance by ministers, however, is difficult and requires a background of study somewhat like that required of case workers.

As to the marriage of divorced persons, extreme caution should be exercised. The readiness with which many ministers perform such marriages is a scandal to the church. When the causes of divorce are not known it is best to request time for investigation or to decline to render the service. These may seem to be harsh measures, but they are necessary, and they may always be carried out with kindness and consideration. Ministers of one communion should be guarded with respect to marriage of divorced persons belonging to another communion. To treat lightly the safeguards which a communion throws about marriage is not only to violate the brotherliness of the larger Christian fellowship but is also to undermine the influence of religion in the community. The churches should more and more take counsel together in these matters and act by common standards.

Reference has been made to the scandal of the so-called "marrying parson." This is not meant to censure ministers who are deservedly popular, or churches which are sought by young people because they have won the affection of the community. The "marrying parson" is the man who intrigues for weddings, who is manifestly commercial, who treats as lightly as he may the safeguards with which the church and society have surrounded marriage. The committee appeal to such ministers to discontinue their traffic. The committee also recommend the exercise of discipline by ecclesiastical bodies where persuasion and admonition are unavailing.

The committee protest urgently against the so-called "stunt" weddings—weddings at fairs, weddings in airplanes and the like. Whatever the motive may be—notoriety, publicity, money-making—such weddings are shameful and debasing. No minister should perform them and public opinion should make them odious. The committee recommend that ministers' associations protest publicly against such weddings.

Appeal to Young People

Young people are themselves the court of last resort in all these matters except as marriage is regulated by the State. They must take responsibility for the integrity of the home. The church has a right of instruction and discipline as long as its members remain in fellowship, but the church is here to help. It must even guard itself against unwarranted interference in the happiness of young people, especially in mixed marriages. The committee appeal with great earnestness to young people not to break recklessly through the restraints of family loyalty. Great numbers of them are taking their lives into their own hands. Many are sinning grievously and with little consideration for those who love them. They will some day realize what they have done when they grieve over their own children. Surely it is not trite to say that a pleasure-seeking life is weakening and destructive of long-time happiness. What young people need is restraint, voluntary restraint of course, and not greater freedom in the form of sex indulgence. Inspiring responsibilities always walk hand in hand with pleasures and privileges. Most young people rise splendidly to responsibility when they see the way clearly, and it is this fact which

gives promise that the homes of generations yet to be will be better than those of today.

A LITTLE SHELF ON MARRIAGE AND HOME

Westermarck, Edward A. *A Short History of Marriage.* 1926. Author's abridgment of the three volume edition. Deals with the family as a social institution. Authoritative and readable.

Rich, Margaret E. (Editor). *Family Life Today.* 1928. Papers of the Buffalo Conference on Family Life in America of October, 1927. Deals with the problems of the family from the experience of family social workers in America.

Richmond and Hall. *Marriage and the State.* 1929. A study, based upon adequate research, of the relation of the state to marriage, state licensing, civil officiants, and marriage and the churches. Completed just before Miss Richmond's death, and her final work.

Lynd, Robert S. and Helen M. *Middletown.* 1929. An illuminating study of a midwestern city. Part II, Chapters IX-XII, deals with "Making a Home." The entire volume is a rich source book on what is happening to the home in American communities.

C. O. P. E. C. Commission Reports. *Volume IV, the Relation of the Sexes.* 1924. An admirable discussion from the point of view of Christian ethics.

Groves, Ernest R. *The Marriage Crisis.* 1928. A constructive and interesting discussion of companionate marriage and current ideas about sex freedom.

Ellis, Havelock. *Little Essays on Love and Virtue.* 1922. Classic essays giving a point of view which it is important to understand. The committee do not agree that sex relations have no social significance except when children are born.

EXTRACTS FROM THE REPORT *

TO THE

GENERAL CONVENTION

OF THE

PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH

OF THE

JOINT COMMISSION TO STUDY THE WHOLE PROBLEM OF DIVORCE — ITS CONDITIONS AND CAUSES

Rt. Rev. Herman Page, D.D., *Chairman*
Rt. Rev. Paul Matthews, D.D.
Rt. Rev. William A. Guerry, D.D.
Rev. Frank H. Nelson, D.D.
Very Rev. William Scarlett, LL.D.
Rev. Percy G. Kammerer, Ph.D., *Secretary*
Mr. John M. Glenn
Mr. F. P. Keppel
Mr. Joseph H. Beale

Seriousness of the Problem

The obvious need in dealing with the subject of divorce is a better understanding of the problem itself. Judges, lawyers, clergymen, and social workers—who would appear qualified to speak on the subject—suggest various causes and remedies frequently quite different from one another. Many of the causes given are doubtless real causes, and many of the proposed remedies have great value; but clearly they deal with the problem only in a partial or superficial way. What is needed is the same thorough study and diagnosis that are characteristic of all good engineering and medical work today.

A glance at some of the causes makes clear the great need

* Reprinted in this volume with the kind consent of the Episcopal Commission.

of such study. Hasty marriages and the lack of uniform divorce laws are commonly given as causes of divorce; and it is maintained that plans for preventing hasty marriages and the adoption of uniform marriage and divorce laws throughout the United States would greatly diminish divorce in this country. The difficulty with these suggestions is the fact that the divorce rate has been rapidly increasing all over the world. In recent years it has more than doubled in many European countries. England and Canada have uniform and strict divorce laws and the banns are frequently published in the churches of these two countries. In Canada the divorce rate is indeed low but it is mounting rapidly and the United States census reports show that in 1922 there were divorced in the United States 1368 couples who had been married in Canada. In London the average number of divorces granted in 1901-05 was 563; in the years 1920-25 the average number was 2734.

The seriousness of the problem of divorce in the United States needs little emphasis. According to the United States Census reports, in 1870 the divorce rate was about 28 to 100,000 population. In 1926 it was 154. In 1887 there was only about 1 divorce to every 17 marriages; and in 1926 there was 1 divorce for every 6 marriages. In many states the ratio of divorces to marriages is about 1 to 3. The sad consequences of divorce are evident on every hand. In many institutions for children a considerable percentage of the inmates come from broken homes. In many private schools the percentage is distressingly large; and the fruits are everywhere seen in our Juvenile Courts. Public interest in the subject has long been wide-spread. In 1881 there was organized the Divorce Reform League which later became a National League for the Protection of the Family. Largely through its efforts an investigation of the divorce situation was authorized by Congress in 1887-88. Further petitions were sent to Congress in the years 1902-05 with the result that President Roosevelt sent a special message to Congress upon the subject. Congress authorized the Census Bureau to make a second investigation covering the period from 1887-1906. In 1915 Congress passed a joint resolution providing for the collection of statistics on marriage and divorce from 1907-15. In 1917 money was appropriated for the work, and a plan was adopted providing for the annual collection of statistics.

Despite the unceasing efforts of the Christian Churches and of others concerned the divorce rate in the United States has increased by leaps and bounds, as the following table shows:

Divorces Per 100,000 Population	
1901	79
1906	84
1916	112
1922	136
1926	154

At present our divorce rate is the highest in the world. In Chicago the rate has trebled since 1887. In the State of Washington the situation became so serious that a few years ago the Judges who heard divorce cases proposed a law looking to some improvement in the prevailing condition. In 1927 there were 36,276 marriages in the State of Michigan and 10,527 divorces. One of the leading Detroit dailies in commenting on this fact says:

> The census figures on marriage and divorce indicate that in Michigan at least, and probably elsewhere, progress is being made backwards by those who are trying to stabilize the holy state of matrimony and reduce the casualties among those who enter it.

Two Proposed Remedies

Among the most common remedies offered for minimizing divorce are plans to prevent hasty marriages such as the publishing of banns and the adoption of uniform marriage and divorce laws throughout the United States.

The desirability of preventing hasty marriages is obvious. The old adage, marry in haste and repent at leisure, is borne out by common experience. Doubtless there are thousands of people who marry on impulse, and it is desirable to take every precaution that marriages may be contracted with all due consideration. It is also clear that many family complications are caused by hasty marriages.

In this connection it may be well to call attention to a valuable study "Happiness in Relation to Age at Marriage" made by Professors Hornell Hart and Wilmer Shields of Bryn Mawr College.[1] The summaries are based on 1000

[1] *Journal of Social Hygiene,* October, 1926.

impartially selected cases from the Court of Domestic Relations and the Marriage License Bureau of Philadelphia. The conclusions reached are that the ideal age for marriage is about 29 for the groom and 24 for the bride; that deviations of 4 years on either side of the ideal age for the groom and that deviations of 2 years on either side for the bride make no appreciable difference; that marriages in which the bride is under 21 years of age or the groom under 24 become rapidly more dangerous as younger ages are reached; that marriages in which either party is 19 or under are 10 to 100 times as risky as marriages of the ideal age, and that marriages of persons over 38 years of age are from 2 to 5 times as likely to result in domestic difficulty as are marriages of the ideal age.

Yet the minimum legal age for marriage for girls in the State of New York is 14 years and there are 12 States that still have a 12-year minimum. Most other States have more rational laws. This is but an illustration of the desirability of good uniform laws on the whole subject of marriage and divorce; but at present in order to avoid the requirements of a State whose laws are good, its inhabitants need only cross the line into another State where the laws are lax. Everyone is familiar with the situation so far as hasty marriages and easy divorces are concerned. The efforts to prevent hasty marriages and to secure good uniform divorce laws are to be encouraged. Nevertheless that they are not going far in the solution of the problem is evidenced by the fact that divorce is becoming increasingly serious all over the world, as the following figures show:

Divorces Per 100,000 Population

Country	1926	1923	1922	1921	1916	1913	1911	1907	1906	1901
United States	154	149	136		112				84	79
Japan		88	92	94	109		113		136	140
France		60	71	83	11		37		27	23
Germany			58	63	15		24		20	14
Switzerland			54	51	40		43		38	30
Belgium			49	49		16	14		9	12
Denmark			39	42	31		27		23	15
Netherlands			28	29	20		16		13	11
Sweden			24	21	13		11		10	7
Australia			22	26	13		12		8	10
Norway			21	23	20		17		9	6
Uruguay				17	13		7	0.1		6
Scotland				11	6				4	4

It is clear that while the divorce rate in the United States is highest, the increase in the divorce rate has been greater in nearly all other Western countries. Since 1901 it has more than doubled in France, it has quadrupled in Germany, nearly doubled in Switzerland, and increased four-fold in Belgium, and so on. These countries all have uniform divorce laws.

Emotional Life Fundamental

Yet basic as the sex instinct is, there is something which seems more basic still, and that is the emotional life of man. A distinguished psychiatrist recently remarked that there are many people who felt that the instincts would take care of themselves, but that this idea was utterly fallacious. He then pointed out that the trouble in life is not with the *instincts* but with the emotions, which dominate the sexual life and all life. Only on this basis can we explain the sad prevalence of sexual perversions and abnormalities which seem so strange and so debased that a normal individual cannot comprehend their existence. In these cases the difficulty is not with the instinct, but with an emotional perversion of it. Obviously a large proportion of the misery and sorrow of life comes through the emotional warping and degradation of the sex instinct, but on the other hand it is generally recognized that a large proportion of the finest achievements of the human race have resulted from the refinement and sublimation of the sex instinct. Mistaken ideas and ideals of life and especially of the sexual life which have been received from parents and the associations of early childhood produce emotional results that it seems almost impossible to outgrow. False modesty on the part of parents and teachers and a morbid curiosity on the part of children produce repressions which often find outlets in unhappy ways. So we find ourselves in a field that involves ideals, likes and dislikes, loves and hatreds, hopes and fears and all those moral and intellectual attitudes toward life that make up what we call human personality.

Divorce Primarily a Character Problem

This brings us face to face with the fact that what is basic in the problem of divorce, as in every other problem of human relationships, is the thing that we call *character.* The word character implies certain standards of right and wrong, and the

ability on the part of the individual to act in accordance with those standards. Much has been said about financial tension, but in most cases the problem is doubtless not so much one of finances as of ability to face the ordinary conditions of life, nearly all of which involves the expenditure of money. Drunkenness, cruelty and sex immorality are problems of character. Many marriages are unhappy for the reason that husbands and wives in their relations with one another frequently do not obey the laws that are basic in every normal human relationship. In many homes there is a freedom of speech, a spirit of criticism and a failure to observe the amenities of life that are recognized as essential in any ordinary friendship; and surely one cannot hope for a happy married life on terms that are lower than those of friendship. Wilfulness, the insistence on one's own way, the failure to show due consideration for the wishes and preferences of each other are constant causes of unhappiness. One must always have profound *respect* for the individuality of another person even when that individuality happens to belong to one's husband or wife. Moreover, every wise human relationship involves the spirit of coöperation, which in turn requires sacrifice and self-denial.

Character may be briefly defined as the ability of the individual to adapt himself to the various conditions and crises of life as they arise. Clearly it is impossible in any education to anticipate the various problems which arise in his life, but the right sort of training should give him the reasonable ability to face them squarely. This is peculiarly the case in marriage. Its experiences cannot be anticipated, but if men and women have character they will have the power to adjust themselves to one another even under most trying circumstances.

Importance of Early Training

Training in character, however, must begin at an exceedingly early age. All psychologists are stressing the fundamental importance of the first five years, with particular emphasis on the very earliest years of life.[2] Professor McDougall, formerly Professor at Harvard, and now Professor of Psychology at Duke University, in his recent book *Character and Conduct of*

[2] *Everyday Problems of the Everyday Child,* Chapters I-III. Douglas A. Thom, M.D., Appleton & Co.

Life[3] goes so far as to declare that while the infant is still in the cradle the foundations of his character are being laid, and a multitude of influences are at work. He particularly emphasizes the influence upon the child through nursing at the mother's breast, saying:

> The nursing of the infant by the mother lays the foundation of the child's later love for her and brings into activity, by sympathetic induction, the infant's capacity for tenderness, prepares it for all later developments of character in which the tender impulse plays a central rôle, all sentiments of love, pity and reverence, all gentleness and considerateness, all good manners and good morals. . . . I suggest that a whole nation brought up on the bottle would show a coarsening of manners, a coldness and hardness in all relations, a lack of the refining influence of tender feeling, the successful cult of which has been a chief service of Christianity to the world.

This may seem rather strong language, but the point of view is corroborated by Dr. Abraham Meyerson, one of the leading Neurologists of Boston,[4] who says:

> Social life starts when the child associates the mother with the milk, with desire and the satisfaction. In the relationship established between mother and baby is the first great social contact; love, friendship, discipline, teaching and belief have their origin when, at the mother's breast, the child separates its mother from the rest of the things of the world.

Good Advice to Adults Usually Futile

As the years go by it becomes increasingly difficult to modify the character that has been formed in early life. While it is not impossible to change it, the difficulties often seem insurmountable. This is what makes so many of the plans for producing happy homes seem positively ridiculous to those who have any real knowledge of human nature. To expect that a little

[3] Pp. 69-71.
[4] *Foundations of Personality*, p. 220.

homily or good advice will make impure men and women faithful in the marital relationship, slovenly women into good housekeepers, a wilful man into a considerate husband, or the lazy and the shiftless into hard working frugal people, and quarrelsome men and women into affectionate husbands and wives, is as reasonable as it was for the ancient king to expect that the tides of the ocean would retire at his command. When the ideals, emotions and habits are once fixed the effort to change them involves a desperate struggle. That Jesus fully realized this is evident from various utterances such as his reply to his disciples when asked why they could not cast out unclean spirits. "This kind cometh forth only by prayer and fasting."

The Influence of Ideals

It is impossible to overemphasize the fact that ideals are absolutely basic in the emotional life and in character. For this reason careful thinkers look for the causes of family disintegration and divorce in changes in the ideals of life which have taken place in the last few centuries. First there was the economic revolution which displaced the family as an economic unit. It is only within a comparatively short period that there has been the great development of *city* life as compared with *rural* life. In *rural* life the family was the producing unit and every member of the family was dependent on every other member. Wherever this condition has prevailed the rate of divorce seems to have been comparatively low. But the modern industrial development has brought people by the thousands from the country to the city. Not only men, but women have become economically independent of their families, and no longer look to them for support. As a consequence the whole ideal of the family has changed. Moreover, since the Protestant Revolution, there has been an increasing emphasis on the importance of the individual, which was bound in time to place women on an equality with men, politically, socially and morally. Along with the development of individualism has also come the general growth of the *romantic* view of life, which is characteristic of modern civilization and especially of America. This pictures the ideal life as a paradise in which everyone has a God-given right to be happy. Its attitude toward marriage is well expressed in the familiar ending of the stories of childhood, "and they

lived happily ever after." From the standpoint of marriage romanticism implies not only freedom of choice in marriage, but also freedom to live one's married life according to one's own wishes. The romantic attitude is characterized by the conviction, especially among women, that marriage should be an eternal honeymoon, with constant demonstrations of affection. Where these are lacking married life is considered a failure. The development of individualism, or the right of every human being to live his own life and to attain the greatest self-expression, coupled with the romantic view of marriage, largely explains the striking tendency in modern life to look on happiness and pleasure as the obvious goals of life. Indeed Professor Ernest Groves in a recent article[5] says that the desire for pleasure is the challenge to marriage in modern life. Therefore when any act or relationship ceases to provide pleasure its value is immediately questioned. This ideal of marriage is quite different from that set forth by Count Keyserling in his *Book of Marriage*[6] where he says that:

> The essential difficulties of life do not end but rather begin with marriage. The conscious acceptance of responsibility in life means *ipso facto* the acceptance of suffering. The fulfillment of marriage and its happiness entail the acceptance of the suffering pertaining to life. It gives the latter a new and deeper meaning.

It is clear therefore that the solution of the problem of divorce requires a knowledge of intimate sex relations, of the emotional life, of character, and of life's ideals. These in turn involve early home training and its ideals, later religious training and religious associations, and such subjects as sex education. It is easy, therefore, to appreciate the difficulties that inhere in any real study of the divorce problem.

What Constitutes a Successful Marriage

Another difficulty is found in the lack of definite standards in regard to normal marriage. What are the conditions, qualities, habits and ideals that make for a successful married life? Who is

[5] *Survey Graphic,* December, 1927, p. 309.
[6] Pp. 13-15.

to tell what the normal ideal of married life is? What may be considered normal sex relations? What should be the attitude of husband and wife toward child bearing? What should be the attitude on birth control? What are the habits of life, the pleasures, the duties, and what is the philosophy of life of those who have been successful in their married life? One of the problems which immediately confronted your Commission was that of securing what is termed a *control group,* that is to say the histories of a considerable number of people who believe that their marriage has been successful.

Questionnaire to the Clergy

It was also decided that light on the whole subject of divorce might be obtained by sending out a questionnaire to the clergy of our own Church, and also to the ministers of the Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist and Congregational Churches. These questionnaires were sent to about 800 clergymen or ministers in each Communion who were in charge of the larger parishes and who represent a cross section of the country. They have had wide experience in city Churches, in large towns and in rural communities. They have also ministered to congregations composed largely of rich people, to those composed of well-to-do people, to those of an industrial character, and to those in which the people were poor. Many congregations were made up of all these classes of people. The questions which were asked were as follows:

1. Please state the number of parishes of which you have had charge, the general nature of each, and the approximate number of communicants in each.

2. Give the number of cases of divorce you can recall in each parish in which both man and wife were regular Church attendants.

3. Give the number of cases of divorce where only one party attended Church. State also whether it was the man who attended Church or the woman.

4. Have you had many industrial workers in any of your parishes? If so, was divorce more frequent among them than among the well-to-do or the rich? If possible give comparative figures.

5. Have many of your parishioners consulted you about their matrimonial problems?

6. Do you require medical certificates from those whom you marry?

7. Do you make special provisions for training young people for married life?

8. Can you give us any other information which you think might be useful to the Commission?

Answers from Our Own Clergy

Of the 800 requests sent to clergy of our own Church about 270 replied. In their ministry they have had charge of 287 parishes and missions in 135 cities and in 35 States, besides the District of Columbia. In their present parishes alone they minister to about 193,000 communicants. Many of them have had long pastorates. It is therefore reasonable to believe that they are familiar with the life and conditions of this Church. They have had experience in 52 rural parishes, 102 town churches, and 130 urban parishes. It should be especially noted that 150 described their parishes as industrial and only 55 as mercantile.

Divorce among Church-Going People

Some of our previous statements have indicated that Baptism in childhood or even church preference may classify a man as a member of a Church, although he may have never attended for years. The first thing one would like to know is the influence of religion and the Church upon his early life. This question, however, could not be easily answered. The next is whether one reasonably can say that at the time they were considering divorce, the Church and religion were dominant factors in the lives of both parties. While many clergymen have divorced people in their parishes with whose history they are not familiar and marry those of whose later history they are ignorant, nevertheless most of them have a reasonably accurate knowledge as to the number of divorces among their regular Church-goers. There are few clergymen who have been in an ordinary parish as long as two years who cannot recall any cases of divorce among their *regular Church-goers,* unless they have happened to be in one of the few parishes of unusual size. Therefore, the picture given in the replies as to divorce among church-going people is probably about as correct as one could hope to obtain.

The following table is significant:

Divorce—where both parties attended Church

Parish (total 787)	Divorces in each parish	Total No. of divorces
612	0	
78	1	78
29	2	58
11	3	33
11	4	44
5	5	25
1	6	6
4	7	28
2	10	20
1	13	13
1	19	19
1	22	22
31	Not known	
787		346

The outstanding fact is that in 612 parishes, or about 77 per cent of the whole, the clergy do not *recall a single divorce,* and in 78 more only 1 each. In other words in 690 or 87 per cent of the total there was but one divorce or less where *both parties regularly attended Church.* It should be noted also how much the rate is raised by 5 parishes which reports a total of 74 divorces—a significant proportion of the whole. One would like to know just what the conditions were in these 5 parishes.

As has already been said the parishes in which the 270 clergymen are at present in charge aggregate about 193,000 communicants. Of these 181 report no divorces whatever, 78, with 58,248 communicants, report a total of 211 divorces. 11 gave no definite answer. Here again one is impressed with the number of parishes in which there were no divorces at all. Therefore, making every allowance for inaccuracies it would appear that the problem of divorce is not especially serious in those cases where both husband and wife are regular attendants of our Church, but that it is confined to relatively few of them. To state it differently, the great amount of divorce attracting attention in the United States today would not appear to be especially serious so far as church-going people are concerned, but rather a problem among those who are in no sense vitally connected with our Churches.

It seems hard to escape the conclusion that there is some

marked connection between the church-going habit and a successful married life, but those who are skilled in such matters would promptly say that these statistics do not necessarily indicate that religion and church-going are the dominant factors in the lives of our people, but rather that the people to whom religion and church-going appeal are the kind who do not get divorces. For instance, a graduate of one of our leading colleges whose memory goes back over nearly 40 years, says that he does not recall a single case of divorce among the members of his college fraternity. However, the fact that there is so little divorce among our church-going people is one that cannot be lightly dismissed.

Divorce and Financial Conditions

In order to get the results of their experience the question was also asked as to the relation of divorce to financial circumstances. The reports of the 111 who replied were as follows:

Divorce more frequent among the well-to-do	61
Divorce more frequent among industrial workers	23
Divorce equally divided between the two groups	27

REPORTS FROM THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

Divorces in which both husband and wife were regular church attendants:

Parishes (total 694)	No. of Divorces	Total No. of Divorces
578	0	0
67	1	67
24	2	48
8	3	24
2	4	8
1	5	5
3	6	18
1	8	8
10	"Few"	
694		178
		10 "Few"

In 83 per cent of parishes, clergymen recall no divorces.

In 9 per cent of parishes, clergymen recall 1 divorce.

In 645, or 92 per cent of parishes, there occurred but one divorce or less where both husband and wife attended Church regularly.

Of the parishes at present in charge of the 220 clergymen who replied, 188 had an aggregate membership of 173,359 (32 did not report any members). Of the entire 220, 142 reported no divorce whatever, while 46 of the remaining 78 clergymen, aggregating 56,947 members, reported 117 divorces. The 32 clergymen giving no number of members reported 29 divorces, making a total of 146 divorces.

On the other hand 300 women and 79 men were reported as regular Church attendants in cases of divorce where only 1 party attended Church. Not included in this number were 32 cases in which sex of attendant was unstated.

In 38 instances the Church felt some obligation toward divorcees who were irregular in attendance.

Economic Status and Divorce

Divorce more frequent among well-to-do	31
Divorce more frequent among industrial workers	15
Divorce not more frequent among industrial workers	27
No difference in two groups	14

Consultations

"Many"	41
"Some"	24
"Not many"	126
"None"	15
"No reply"	14
	220

Medical Certificate

203 required no certificate. Twelve ministers made a health requirement a prerequisite to the marriage ceremony. (Some clergymen felt the State requirement in regard to health to be sufficient.) Others residing in States demanding no health certificate expressed a need for such a requirement.

Training for Marriage

"Special" training given	29
"Very little" or "Some" training given	28
"No" training given	157
No reply	6
	220

Right Ideals of Marriage

Nothing can be more important than the right ideal of marriage. Christ's ideal, which has always been that of the Christian Church, is the lifelong union of one man with one woman. But Christ's ideal was not merely one of his own making. He enunciated a law which he declared God has ordained as fundamental to human society.

> But from the beginning of the creation, male and female made He them. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother and cleave to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh; so they are no more two, but one flesh. What, therefore, God has joined together let no man put asunder. (Mark 10:6-9.)

Despite the fact that divorce was allowed among the Jews, the ideal of Christ was the real ideal of the Jewish Race, and its standards of family life have long been recognized as exceedingly high. Westermark in his *Short History of Marriage*[7] says that monogamy is the only form of marriage that is permitted among every people, and he bids us remember that obligatory monogamy was the exclusive form of marriage recognized in the European Societies in which Christianity was first engrafted. He also says that there are in sexual love itself certain elements that tend to make men inclined to restrain themselves to one wife at least for some time. He also says:

> This absorbing passion is not confined to the human race. Good observers have shown that it is obeyed by birds, and Darwin found it among certain domesticated animals.[8]

Again he says:[9]

> I think we may without hesitation assert that if mankind will advance in the same direction as hitherto, if consequently the causes to which monogamy in the most progressive societies owes its origin will continue to operate with constantly growing force, if especially in regard to the

[7] Pp. 247-248.
[8] See also Chapter I, pp. 3-7, Westermark's *Short History of Marriage.*
[9] P. 249.

feelings of women, and the women's influence on legislation, the laws of monogamy are not likely to be changed.

In a significant paper, read before a recent Conference of the Association for organizing Family Social Work, at Buffalo, by Dr. H. S. Jennings, Professor of Zoölogy and Director of the Zoölogical Laboratory at Johns Hopkins University, entitled "From Amœba Up" (published in the *Survey Graphic,* December, 1927) he traced the development of the family from the beginnings of organic life. After pointing out a tendency toward a permanent monogamous marriage in animal life, especially among eagles, hawks and other birds of prey, he declares:

> The monogamous family with life-long union of mates appears as the final term in a long evolutionary series.

In conclusion he says:

> The fact that he (man) is a mammal; his long and helpless infancy; the high development of his mating and paternal impulses; and his diversified and exacting life career, appear to be met most adequately (though obviously still imperfectly) by the life-long monogamous family.

The Family as the Chief Educational Institution

The position of the family in society is fundamental, even as an educational institution. Indeed, the family must be regarded as the greatest educational institution in the world. In the sense that education is what is given to one by others, consciously or unconsciously, for meeting the problems of his life, this assertion stands today in spite of the widespread years of education from the nursery school on one hand to the equipment for adult education on the other. We have already pointed out the basic importance of emotional and character education in the earliest years, and have emphasized the fact that if the right training is not given in the earliest years the chances of acquiring it later steadily diminish. Therefore, the breaking up of a home threatens the right training of personality at the most vital period. Moreover, the home ministers to another profound human craving, quite as strong as that for variety, namely, the hunger for permanence. This is well expressed in the attitude of the English-born all over the world, in the

use of the word *home.* It is also pictured again in the various conceptions of Heaven, where many people feel they shall find *home* at the last. In the minds of the great mass of men the word *home* is still synonymous with Heaven here on earth, and one may well say that one of the most fundamental desires of every normal man and woman is to make a permanent home. Dr. Rufus Jones well says: [10]

> A home penetrated with spiritual culture and spiritual ideals is the highest product of civilization and it in turn ministers all the time toward the creation of a still higher civilization. In fact there is nothing of what we mean by civilization where the home is wanting. The savage is on his way out of savagery and barbarity as soon as he can create a home and make family life at all sacred. The real horror of the slums in our great cities is that there are no homes there, only human beings crowded indiscriminately into one room. Our present society will be well on its way out of the existing moral chaos as soon as the home is restored and rededicated to its spiritual functions.
>
> The home is the true unit of society. It determines more than any other one influence, and perhaps more than all influences combined, what the destiny of the boy or girl shall be. It shapes the social life; it makes the church possible; it is the true basis of the state and nation. Men and women each for self, with no holy center of family life, could never compose either a church or a state.

Need of Education for Marriage

One of the convictions which is growing is that definite training in human relationships should be given in our homes, schools, normal schools, colleges, and seminaries, as well as in our churches. Professor Groves writes as follows: [11]

> There is a special need of giving pre-family education in normal schools, schools of law and theological seminaries. From the normal schools come teachers who easily, through ignorance, hamper family life. Law, through legislation, influences the family constantly, and it is most important

[10] *The Survey Graphic* for December, 1927, p. 314.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 310.

that those trained in legal matters should have a grasp of the science of family relationships. From the ministers we expect assistance in furthering every sort of wholesome social enterprise, and if their idealism is actually to function in service for the family they need to be better grounded in the application of science to family problems; this is particularly true of the Protestant clergy who at present do not develop from experience the concrete understanding of family difficulties that the priests through confession more frequently attain.

In many universities one may learn today the principles of business management, about international relationships, how to breed animals, and almost anything about machinery, but there seems to be little definite instruction given in the art of relating one human being to another; and for no relationship is this training needed more than for marriage. Marriage is the concern of every human being, and it would seem that nothing could be more important than real education for this relationship. It cannot be doubted that there are laws that govern the life of the individual; so there are laws that govern the relationship of marriage. Many of these laws can be ascertained and people trained to observe them. Yet if one looks over the catalogues of our colleges and universities today he finds many courses on marriage as an institution, endless courses on ethics and psychology, but it does not appear that much training is being given for marriage itself. However, certain of our universities have made a beginning.

Training for marriage also involves sex training. This is a difficult subject because it is so intimate, but the crying need for education in these lines is apparent on every hand. Thousands of men and women are suffering from sex difficulties because they did not receive wholesome training in such matters in their earliest years. We must face this fact fairly and carefully. Clergymen, Church workers, Church school teachers, must have a part in this education as well as the parents. What that part is must be carefully thought out.

Responsibility of the Church for Character Training

The responsibility of the Church for character training needs no further emphasis, but it is well to point out again the fact

that such training cannot be given most effectively from the pulpit. It involves a carefully developed plan of religious education which includes our homes, our Church schools, our adult classes, and which involves many personal interviews with the clergy and Church workers. No one would be more ready than the clergy to admit their relative lack of training for this responsibility.

INTRODUCTION TO STERILIZATION FOR HUMAN BETTERMENT *

E. S. GOSNEY

The human race has developed through countless ages under the laws of heredity by the survival of the fittest. The weak and defective have perished. Only the physically strong and mentally alert could withstand the severe conditions of early life, reach maturity, and become the fathers and mothers of the next generation.

Modern civilization, human sympathy, and charity have intervened in Nature's plan. The weak and defective are now nursed to maturity and produce their kind.

Under Nature's law we bred principally from the top. Today we breed from the top and bottom, but more rapidly from the bottom. Today the most intelligent and efficient, the strongest strains of blood, as a rule, limit their children to a point that means the extinction of a family in a few generations.

We need constructive charity along with our present patchwork variety that tends to increase the burdens of race degeneracy and family suicide.

Statistics of the mentally disabled are largely estimates, but conservatively speaking, four per cent or 4,800,000, of the people of the United States will at some time in their lives need the care of an institution for mental diseases because of some form of insanity. Of the feeble-minded it is estimated that half of one per cent, or 600,000, of the people of the United States have a mentality below seven years and need constant supervision and assistance either at home or in an

* From *Sterilization for Human Betterment* by E. S. Gosney and Paul Popenoe, copyright, 1930, Macmillan Company, and reprinted with the authors' consent.

institution. Above this class it is estimated that one per cent, or 1,200,000, have a mentality of from seven to nine years. This class, with a few exceptions, cannot get along alone; it must have more or less constant supervision.

Above this comes the more dangerous, eugenically speaking, moron class with its many problems. Los Angeles and other cities have recently made a survey of the children in the public schools, and find that in the first eight grades there are more than four per cent of children with less than three-fourths of normal intellect. If we add the half of one per cent in the first class, and assume that this estimate holds true for the adults, we can conservatively estimate that practically five per cent or 6,000,000 of the inhabitants of the United States, have an intellectuality which is less than seventy-five per cent of that of the average man.

Just how much insanity may be traced to inheritance is a difficult problem, because there is often an exciting cause, an injury, shock, or sickness. The latent heredity develops: family and friends place the blame entirely on the exciting cause.

In the feeble-minded, heredity is more apparent. Some noted families exhibit this in a striking manner, such as the Kallikak family, in which the founder had an illegimate son by a feeble-minded woman. From this son in five generations were traced four hundred eighty offspring, only forty-six of whom were known to be normal. The same father subsequently married a normal woman, from whom in six generations were descended four hundred ninety-six offspring, only one of whom was known not to be normal. In the first family, there were all forms of feeble-mindedness, degeneracy, and crime; in the second there were tradesmen, teachers, preachers, lawyers, judges, and a high quality of citizenship generally.

We might mention other families such as the Jukes, with six generations and 1200 defectives; the Nam family, with ninety per cent feeble-minded; the Zeros, tribe of Ishmael, etc., each family costing its respective state from one to three million dollars.

Ohio, some years ago, published a statement showing that it was then expending $5,000,000 yearly in caring for defectives in its public institutions, and estimated that the civilized world was paying $5,000,000,000 annually for the same purpose.

This cost in money is trivial compared with the heartaches,

crime, and horror that find their origin in these defectives. No sane man would wish to bring into life a child so defective that it could not be a self-sustaining, respectable citizen. Such children should never be born. They are a burden to themselves, a burden to their family, a burden to the state, and a menace to civilization. Certainly if anything can be done, which is sanctioned by common sense and good morals, to prevent this accumulation of human misery and degeneracy, it should be done.

What can be done?

The prevention of reproduction by castration has been practiced as far back as we find historic records. But sterilization by the simple surgical operation now practiced and herein described, without mutilation and without unsexing the patient, was discovered only in the last half century. Theoretically it should have no effect except to prevent parenthood, and experience indicates that it has no other effect.

Nearly twenty years ago California, Indiana, and other states passed laws authorizing the sterilization of the hereditary defectives in their state institutions. Most of these laws also carried a provision for sterilization as a penalty for certain crimes. The penal section has generally been held unconstitutional, as in conflict with the provision prohibiting "cruel and unusual punishments."

Eugenic sterilization of the hereditary defective is a protection, not a penalty, and should never be made a part of any penal statute. The United States Supreme Court has recently sustained the legality of eugenic sterilization. In the case of Buck vs. Bell, where a feeble-minded woman who had a feeble-minded mother and a feeble-minded child was to be sterilized against her will, Justice Holmes, in handing down the decision, said, "Three generations of imbeciles are enough."

A score of years have passed since the first sterilization laws were adopted. Thinking people are asking, What have been the actual results of human sterilization? Here in California is the one place where these results have been clearly ascertained. No fewer than 6255 sterilizations had been performed prior to January 1, 1929, in the institutions of this state—practically three times as many official sterilizations as had been performed in all the rest of the United States. We have traced the records and results of these sterilizations as far as possible, and have

published them in full in a series of technical papers in various scientific journals, so that anyone who is interested in going to the original data can find these data presented in a critical fashion. In the first part of this book, we give a summary of our findings; in the second part, some conclusions to which these findings, and a general consideration of sterilizations elsewhere, have led us.

State officials and medical staffs of these institutions have coöperated heartily in our research. These officials and staffs deserve great credit for the sane, conservative, and diplomatic way in which they have handled the administration of the sterilization laws.

The value of research such as this depends upon the manner in which it is done, and therefore upon the qualifications and efficiency of the parties doing it. This requires a personal statement. Having determined to make this research, it was not easy to find the right man to put in charge. Three years ago, we employed Paul Popenoe to take charge of the work.[1]

Our executive board agree with me that we were most fortunate in securing Mr. Popenoe for this enterprise.

In this work, we have also had the coöperation and aid of many students of eugenics and heredity throughout this country and in Europe, besides the active assistance of an advisory board consisting of the late Dr. J. H. McBride of Pasadena, Dr. George Dock of Pasadena, Henry M. Robinson of Los Angeles, Chancellor David Starr Jordan and Professor Lewis M. Terman of Stanford University, Professors S. J. Holmes and H. M. Evans of the University of California, Dean Justin Miller of the College of Law, University of Southern California, Otis H. Castle and Joe G. Crick of Los Angeles and Pasadena, and C. M. Goethe of Sacramento. Every manuscript has been submitted, before publication, to each of the members of this board, as well as to a large number of other consultants for whose advice and suggestions we are grateful.

We are particularly indebted to Dr. Robert L. Dickinson, secretary of the Committee on Maternal Health, for putting at our disposal his wide knowledge and long experience in the medical and surgical aspects of sterilization; to Dr. H. H. Laughlin, superintendent of the Eugenics Record Office, who has followed the development of sterilization in the United States

[1] See p. 9 for biographical sketch.

more closely than any other student; to the American Eugenics Society for constant and hearty coöperation, and to Major Leonard Darwin, honorary president of The Eugenics Society (London), for his active interest and encouragement.

Our publication and research work is now turned over to the Human Betterment Foundation, which was organized for the purpose of completing and perpetuating this and other constructive work, not repair work, along the lines indicated by the name.

Summary of the Results

Of the 6255 sterilizations in California state hospitals there were six hundred one more males than females.

In the feeble-minded sterilizations, 1488 in all, there were three hundred thirty more females than males. All feeble-minded patients are now sterilized before they are allowed to leave the state home at Sonoma.

One in twelve of all the insane admitted to the state hospital since the law was passed has been sterilized. One in five or six of the new admissions is now sterilized.

Sterilization is done only where there is apparent danger of defective children.

Failures

Of the entire sterilizations in the state, there are three known failures in the male (vasectomies). There are four known failures in the female (salpingectomies). This is a much higher percentage of efficiency than that recorded in other places of this country and Europe, and shows the expertness of the work.

In all of the sterilizations of the state institutions of California, there have been only four deaths, two of which resulted from the anesthetic and two from infection. One of these, a feeble-minded girl, tore the dressings off from the wound and doubtless infected herself.

Attitude of Patients and Their Relatives

Consent of the nearest relatives is always obtained when practicable, and this consent to the sterilization becomes more easy to obtain from year to year as the effects and results are better understood.

Of the insane patients sterilized, six out of every seven replying to inquiries were satisfied with the operation. One out of every seven expressed dissatisfaction, but their complaints were not of a serious nature. Most of the dissenters felt that sterilization would be a good thing for the defective or mentally diseased, but that it did not apply to their cases—such complaints only as one would expect from a mentally unbalanced person. No serious dissatisfaction was found among relatives. Social workers of the state seemed to be virtually unanimous in their commendations of the result.

Conduct on Parole

Of the feeble-minded on parole, two-thirds have gotten along satisfactorily, one-third have been failures due chiefly to dullness and objectionable personality.

We have paid special attention to the problem of the effect of sterilization on sexual promiscuity. Among the paroled feeble-minded, we have found no male charged with sex offenses. One in every twelve of the females paroled after sterilization becomes a sex offender, but nine out of twelve in the same group were sex offenders before commitment to the state institution. This improvement is not wholly due to the effect of sterilization, but is doubtless attributable in part to the training they received in the state institution and to the fact that they know they are on parole and will be returned to the state institution if they do not behave themselves.

Effect on the Life of the Patient

Sterilization destroys no organ or gland of the body. Our investigations show that it has no effect upon sex desire, sex performance, or sex feeling of the subject, except a favorable psychological effect in some cases, particularly where the fear of pregnancy is removed.

Marriage

More than one hundred twenty-five feeble-minded, sterilized girls on parole have married. The majority have turned out well. These girls could not have succeeded if they had been burdened with responsibility for the care of children, particularly of feeble-minded children.

Private Sterilization

Probably as many women have been sterilized in private practice as in state institutions. These have mostly been because of bad hearts, bad lungs, or bad kidneys, rendering child-birth dangerous to the life of the mother. Many hospitals now refuse to perform abortions unless they sterilize at the same time. We feel that the time has come when there should be some form of state supervision over all sterilization.

The Laws

The present statutes of most states need amendment.

CLASSIFIED BIBLIOGRAPHY

History of Marriage

Westermarck, Edward A. *A Short History of Marriage.* 1926. The author's abridgment of the three volume edition. Authoritative and readable.

Goodsell, Willystine. *A History of the Family as a Social and Educational Institution.* 1927.

Calhoun, Arthur W. *A Social History of the American Family from Colonial Times to the Present.* 1919. Three important books for reference.

General Books on Family Life

Spencer, Anna Garlin. *The Family and its Members.* 1923. A practical and helpful book written out of a rich experience in the home and in education.

Fiske, George W. *The Changing Family.* 1928. Discusses helpfully the problems which confront the family today because of economic conditions, new attitudes toward authority, the decline of family religion, and the prevalence of commercialized recreation.

The Christian Family—a shorter volume, particularly adapted for group study.

Groves and Ogburn. *American Marriage and Family Relationships.* 1928. A serious study of the status of family life in America today. Part II is a valuable series of statistical studies by Professor Ogburn.

Sanger, Margaret. *Happiness in Marriage.* 1926. A helpful discussion of successful adjustment in marriage.

Sex Education

Eddy, Geo. Sherwood. *Sex and Youth,* 1928. Written for the youth of the world by one who knows and understands.

Bigelow, Maurice A. *Sex Education.* 1916. This volume by an eminent professor at Columbia University is an excellent introduction to sex education because it makes clear the importance of integrating such instruction in the larger program of education.

Galloway, Thomas W. *Parenthood and the Character Training of Children.* 1927. An excellent book for parents' classes by one who was for years teacher of biology. Very helpful on the relation of sex to character development.

De Schweinitz, Karl. *Growing Up.* 1928. The story of reproduction

and birth for boys and girls. It is written in story form and illustrated, to be read either to or by the child, or to be used by parents in answering questions of the child.

Lay, Wilfred. *A Plea for Monogamy,* 1923. A splendid presentation of the difficulties and triumphs of married life.

Hamilton and Macgowan. *What is Wrong with Marriage?* A popular analysis of the results of investigating two hundred married persons.

Binkley and Binkley. *What is Wrong with Marriage?* 1929. A positive and constructive appraisal of marriage and its contribution to human life.

Keyserling, Count Hermann. *The Book of Marriage,* 1926. A comprehensive presentation of the whole problem.

Pamphlets of the American Social Hygiene Association. 370 Seventh Avenue, New York.
Choosing a Home Partner.
Sex in Life.
The Question of Petting.
Sex Education.
Training Youth for Parenthood.
Your Daughter's Mother.
The Sex Factor in Character Training.
Child Questions and Their Answers.
The Boy Problem.

Relation of the Sexes

C. O. P. E. C. Commission Reports. *Volume IV, The Relation of the Sexes.* 1924. An admirable and charming book, having the point of view of Christian ethics.

Margold, Charles W. *Sex Freedom and Social Control.* 1926. A concise and trenchant discussion of radical sex attitudes, social conflict in sex conduct, and the reality of group standards.

Neumann, Henry. *Modern Youth and Marriage.* 1928. "Is it possible to counter the current of looser views without slighting the eminently just demand of youth for freedom? These pages suggest that an educational program with this end in view can and should be worked out." A strong and enlightened book.

Royden, A. Maude. *Sex and Common Sense.* 1922. This book, by a gifted woman, contains many valuable passages and throws a light into the emotional life and sacrifices of unmarried women.

Popenoe, Paul. *Modern Marriage.* 1926. Recommended because of its common sense advice to men with regard to conditions of happiness in the home.

The Conservation of the Family, 1926. Another strong plea for the institution of the home.

Applied Eugenics

Guyer, M. F. *Being Well Born.* 1927. An authoritative study of the laws of heredity as applied to human mating and the improvement of the human species. Bibliography.

Downing, Elliott R. *Elementary Eugenics.* 1928. Brings to young people in non-technical language the outstanding facts about heredity.

Economics and the Home

Douglas, Paul H. *Wages and the Family.* 1927. A thorough discussion of the living wage and family allowance systems based upon the cost of living.

Abel, Mary W. *Successful Family Life on the Moderate Income.* 1927. Full of practical advice.

Collier, Virginia M. *Marriage and Careers.* 1926. A question growing daily more important.

Epstein, Abraham. *The Challenge of the Aged.* 1928. Mr. Epstein summarizes the available material concerning old age dependency. He concludes that the chief causes of old age dependency are low earning power, physical disability, unemployment, strikes and business failure, rather than idleness or thriftlessness.

Parents and Children

O'Shea, M. V. (Editor). *The Child: His Nature and His Needs.* 1924. Articles by sixteen specialists selected by the Children's Foundation. Nothing better for the use of those who wish to bring themselves up to date without much reading.

De Lima, Agnes. *Our Enemy the Child.* 1926. Miss De Lima describes school rooms, teachers, children and the reactions of teachers and children as they operate under the rigid curricula usually required in the schools, and under the more flexible curricula of progressive and experimental schools. Critical but easy to read.

Groves, E. R. and Gladys H. *Parents and Children.* 1928. The section for young people who are planning to marry is especially valuable.

Pyle, William H. *Training Children.* 1929. Not so much a study of theory as a manual of sound advice and specific instruction. It makes available for the average person the more important results of recent experimentation and research.

Religion in the Home

Weigle, Luther A. *The Training of Children in the Christian Family.* 1922. Deals helpfully with the objectives, methods and materials which belong in the program of child training in the Christian home.

Cope, Henry. *Religious Education in the Family.* 1915. An analysis of the factors which make up the problem of the modern home, and suggestions as to materials and methods available for family education in religion.

Hodges, George. *The Training of Children in Religion.* 1911. A discussion in popular language of the various aspects of child training in religion from the point of view of the Episcopalian.

Coe, George A. *A Social Theory of Religious Education.* 1917. Valu-

able chapters on "The Family" and "The Church School" and bibliography.

Kagawa, Toyohiko. *Love, the Law of Life,* 1929. A magnificent appraisal of the dominant motive in life.

Devotional Helps for Husbands and Wives

Warnel, H., and Moehlman, C. H. *Sayings of Jesus.* 1928. An arrangement of the teachings of Jesus by subjects which brings out their original significance.

Acts of Devotion. 1927. In beauty of phrase and diction as remarkable as its scope and spirit. It gives expression to the aspirations which are firing the hearts of the modern world. Intensely personal, intensely social.

Rauschenbusch, Walter. *Prayers of the Social Awakening.* 1929. The work by which Walter Rauschenbusch will probably be longest known.

Tileston, M. W. *Daily Strength for Daily Needs.* An old but very helpful manual of devotion for each day of the year.

Health and the Home

Haggard, Howard W. *What You Should Know About Health and Disease.* 1928. The author, who is associate professor of applied physiology, Yale University, explains all that the layman needs to know about the structure and functions of the human body and the derangements to which it is subject. The kind of book that is good for a household. Intelligible and confidence inspiring.

Frankel, Lee K., and Armstrong, Donald B. *A Popular Encyclopedia of Health.* 1926. A new-time family medical book. Tells what to do when sick, when the doctor is needed and how to live so as to avoid preventable illness. Popular but scientific.

The National Health Series. Edited by the National Health Council. 1924 to 1928. In order to provide the general public with authoritative books on health at low cost, the National Health Council has issued this series of little manuals by leading authorities:
Man and the Microbe; The Body's Health; Personal Hygiene; Community Health; Cancer; The Human Machine; The Young Child's Health; The Child in School; Tuberculosis; The Quest of Health; Love and Marriage; Food for Health's Sake; Health of the Worker; Exercises for Health; Venereal Diseases; Your Mind and You; Taking Care of Your Heart; The Expectant Mother; Home Care of the Sick; Adolescence; What Everyone Should Know About Eyes; Diabetes and Its Treatment; Care of the Mouth and Teeth.

Recreation and the Home

Cabot, Richard C. *What Men Live By.* 1914. From his experience as a physician Dr. Cabot advises the use of four cures—work, play, love, worship—to bring back the patient and all others into the current of "real life."

Lee, Joseph. *Play in Education.* 1915. A standard book on the philosophy of play and its meaning in life.

Pamphlets by the Playground and Recreation Association of America. 315 4th Ave., New York, N. Y.
Home Play.
Social programs for family, churches, women's organizations, etc.
The Wisdom of Leisure, John Finley, Free.
Leisure and the Home, Theodore Roosevelt, Free.
Children's Play and Juvenile Delinquency, Free.

Brimmer, F. E. *Motor Campcraft.* 1923. The automobile has opened new fields of recreation and adventure in which the whole family may share. This handbook by a motor enthusiast and writer will be found useful and suggestive.

Handy. A loose-leaf manual in serviceable binder, for leaders of church-center recreation, related to the contribution of the church to the leisure time of the home. Ingenious and useful.

Family Disorganization and Divorce

Mowrer, Ernest R. *Family Disorganization.* 1927. Valuable also for its study of statistical method.

Colcord, Joanna C. *Broken Homes.* 1919. An important study of family desertion and its social treatment.

Lichtenberger, James P. *Divorce: Study in Social Causation.* 1909. Still one of the most thorough studies of divorce.

Johnsen, Julia E. *Selected Articles on Marriage and Divorce.* 1925. Both sides of federal marriage and divorce laws. A discussion manual.

Marriage and Divorce, 1926. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1928.

May, Geoffrey. *Marriage Laws and Decisions in the United States.* 1929. An important compilation for reference and study. Important to pastors.

Adjustment of Unhappy Homes

Richmond, Mary E. *What Is Social Case Work?* 1922. A little classic by one of the founders of social case work in America. Valuable for ministers in their dealings with individuals and families.

De Schweinitz, Karl. *The Art of Helping People Out of Trouble.* 1924. Scientific but written in excellent style for the general reader. Embodies the experience of family social work.

Dexter, Robert C. *Social Adjustment.* 1927. A practical treatise on problems of social adjustment of all kinds. Valuable for pastors.

Records of Happy Marriages

Parker, Cornelia S. *An American Idyll.* 1921.

Palmer, George H. *Life of Alice Freeman Palmer.* 1924.

ISU LIBRARY
3 2792 014 019 156

Withdrawn
IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
of Science and Technology
Library

846456

Iowa State University Library
Ames, Iowa 50010